

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 28, 1982

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, we ask Your blessing upon the people of our world. With all the forces that separate us and the hatred which keeps us from appreciating our common humanity, we pray that our spirits will be enlightened by Your presence as we are given hope by Your promises. Give us the willingness to use our talents in ways that cause understanding between nations and give peace to troubled hearts. This we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 25, 1982, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE 97TH CONGRESS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding.

The U.S. Army Band (Pershing's Own), under the direction of Col. Eugene W. Allen, leader and commander, entered the door to the left of the Speaker, took the positions assigned to them, and presented a prelude concert.

The honored guests, the Honorable James Roosevelt, Mr. Elliott Roosevelt, Mrs. John Roosevelt, and grandchildren and great-grandchildren of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt entered the door to the right of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. James P. Molloy, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who

entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 220, the joint meeting to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt will come to order.

The Doorkeeper announced the flag of the United States.

The flag was carried into the Chamber by the Joint Armed Forces Color Guard.

The National Anthem was presented by the U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club, John Talley, director.

The Color Guard saluted the Speaker, faced about, and saluted the House. The Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. The invocation will be given by the Rev. James David Ford, Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following invocation:

We ask Your blessing, O God, as we come together to celebrate the life of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to recall his deeds done for this Nation, and to dedicate ourselves to the tasks of our day. As we look to the past, O God, we are grateful for leaders who inspired and gave courage, who transcended the common level of life and who gave hope in difficult times. May the contributions of him whom we remember this day encourage each of us to face the concerns of our time that we may be worthy of the heritage that we have received as a free people. May Your providence continue to strengthen our hearts and bless our Nation that in all things we may truly do justice, love mercy and ever walk humbly with You. This we pray. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Color Guard will now post the colors.

The flag was posted, and the Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. We are honored today to have with us some of the members of the Roosevelt family, our former colleague, the Honorable James Roosevelt, Mr. Elliott Roosevelt, and Mrs. John Roosevelt, and the many grandchildren and great-grandchildren of the late President.

Will they all kindly rise, please? [Applause.]

We are also pleased to have some of the associates of the late President: Ms. Grace Tully, Mr. Benjamin Cohen, and Mr. James Rowe. [Applause.]

And from the President's home State of New York, the Honorable Hugh Carey, a former Member, and the Governor of New York. [Applause.]

We will now have a medley of songs by the U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club.

An interlude of songs was presented by the U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club.

□ 1110

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the noted author and historian of the Roosevelt age, Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. [Applause.]

Dr. SCHLESINGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of Congress, friends, it is a high honor for me to share with three such doughty warriors for liberty and justice as Averell Harriman, CLAUDE PEPPER, and JENNINGS RANDOLPH the opportunity to address this most eminent legislative body in the world.

It is, indeed, a most special occasion that brings us together. We have heard all our lives about the first hundred days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. We gather today to celebrate his first hundred years.

This is not a partisan occasion. Franklin Roosevelt, as he liked to say, was an old campaigner who loved a good fight; but he was not a strict party man. He cast his first Presidential vote for a progressive Republican—after his own party had nominated a conservative Democrat. As President himself in 1933, he appointed two Republicans to his Cabinet. Seven years later, under the shadow of war, he appointed two more.

"People tell me," he observed at a Democratic party dinner in 1940, "that I hold to party ties less tenaciously

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

than most of my predecessors in the Presidency, that I have too many people in my administration who are not active party Democrats. I admit the soft impeachment."

A few months before his death he was exploring the possibility of a political alliance with the very man whom the Republicans had run against him just 4 years earlier. And, while we are contemplating the latitudinarianism with which Presidents sometimes regard political parties, it may not be amiss to recall that a Republican President, not too far from here today, cast his first four Presidential ballots for Franklin Roosevelt.

Jefferson put it classically in his first inaugural: "We have called by different names brethren of the same principle."

Today, to bring Jefferson up to date, we are all Democrats, we are all Republicans, as we join to honor a man who belongs not just to a party but to the essential history of this great Republic and to the intimate personal lives of most of us in this illustrious Chamber.

For Franklin Roosevelt led our Nation—led every one of us over the age of 50—through what have been, save for the Civil War, the two most grievous crises in our national life as a free state: the worst depression in American history and the greatest war in American history.

It is hard today to remember that America, now so rich and bountiful, was once, not too many years ago, a land of grim poverty and aching want, where millions who sought jobs could not find them, where factories stood empty and silent and crops rotted in the fields and men huddled in line to get a cup of soup and a piece of bread and children fought for food in garbage dumps.

Fifty years ago a blanket of despair was settling across the land. In the 1932 election, more than a million votes were cast for parties dedicated to the abolition of the capitalist system.

It is hard to remember today that America, now a great military superpower, was once, not too many years ago, a beset and embattled nation, its great warships sunk at Pearl Harbor, its new and inexperienced Army fighting for its life in North Africa and Italy, in France, and Guadalcanal, its gallant men dying on the Atlantic and the Pacific, in China, and in the skies over Japan. These terrible ordeals are now distant recollections. They recede in memory because we overcame them; and we overcame them in great part because of the exceptional qualities of leadership that Franklin Roosevelt brought to his high office—qualities that nerved his countrymen to fulfill their best and bravest selves.

An idealist in purpose, a realist in tactics, F. D. R. combined boldness and caution, openness and devious-

ness, compassion and ruthlessness, a genius for manipulation and a genius for inspiration. He not only enjoyed being President and communicated that enjoyment to the country, but he knew how to be President. He surrounded himself with singularly able and outspoken men and women and drove them successfully in the same harness. He fought depression and war with a White House staff far smaller than recent Presidents have required for less arduous challenges.

Roosevelt was a wonderfully effective President, because he had both the craft and the will to work steadily toward his objectives, and he was a great President because he loved this country, its meadows and plains, and forests, its spirited cities, its tranquil valleys, and its rushing streams; and because he imparted to the land he loved a noble vision of the future—the vision of a nation that could be humane and free and abundant, the vision of a world that could be ordered and peaceful and just.

He embodied this vision in a glittering personality—intrepid, exhilarating, and serene. In many ways a conventional man, he had a zest for unconventional ideas. Nurtured in the securities of a patrician past, he faced with equanimity the terrors of a shadowed future. The world, he understood, was in the throes of incessant and inexorable change. Like Lincoln before him, he regarded the dogmas of the quiet past as inadequate to the stormy present.

"We must disenthral ourselves," as Lincoln said, "and then we shall save our country."

Franklin Roosevelt saw politics as an educational process, a process of intellectual liberation, and he saw experiment as the method of democracy. He doubted that democracy could endure when one-third of the Nation was ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished. The urgent need, he liked to say, was to establish "a fair and just concert of interests"—to restore the balance of life and opportunity between business, labor, and agriculture, city and countryside, north and south and west, and he saw the National Government as the people's indispensable instrument in the abiding battle for balance, decency and justice.

We have a philosophical argument today between those who suppose that if we leave the economy to its own devices, our problems will solve themselves, and those who believe that Government has a vital role to play in promoting the general welfare.

□ 1120

No one can doubt where F. D. R. stood.

A laissez faire attitude in face of human suffering, he said, demanded "not only greater stoicism but greater faith in immutable economic law and

less faith in the ability of man to control what he has created than I, for one, have."

Such views may not be popular at this moment. But the debate between private power and public purpose has gone on since the founding of the Republic. No one should think it to have been finally resolved in this particular year of grace.

F. D. R.'s response to economic crisis remolded the framework of American life, civilized our economic system, and restored popular faith in democratic institutions. Had the despair of the Depression deepened, the anti-Communist votes of 1932 would have become many millions in 1936 and 1940, but in fact by 1940, that vote had dwindled to a pathetic 150,000.

Business leaders did not altogether appreciate Roosevelt's efforts on their behalf, and called him a traitor to his class. The achievement of the New Deal, it may be said, was to save capitalism from the capitalists. [Applause.]

Roosevelt's revitalization of democracy had impact far beyond our own borders. This was a time when across the world fanatic ideologies sacrificed human beings on the altar of dogma. Against the intoxication of creeds and the tyranny of absolutes, Roosevelt fought the fight of decent men and women struggling day by day to make a better life for their children. He steered between the extremes of orthodoxy and revolution, moving always, as he said, "slightly to the left of center."

"His impulse," said Winston Churchill, long before the glory of their wartime partnership, "is one which makes toward the fuller life of the masses of people in every land, and which, as it glows the brighter, may well eclipse both the lurid flames of German-Nordic self-assertion and the baleful, unnatural lights which are diffused from Soviet Russia."

Roosevelt understood that America could not be safe as a democratic island in the totalitarian world. He awoke us from our isolationist slumbers and led us superbly through the agony of war itself.

The generation, that triumphed over the most devastating economic troubles and the most deadly military foes in our history showed the world what Americans are truly capable of.

We have our own great problems again, but it does no good to exaggerate their difficulty or our impotence in dealing with them. Crises ahead always look worse than crises surmounted. This does not prove that they are. Self-pity is not one of human kind's ennobling traits. The crises that confronted Franklin Roosevelt and Abraham Lincoln and George Washington were fairly considerable, too.

As we meet the problems of our own age—and meet them we must—we can surely take heart from the memory of F. D. R. from his boundless courage, his inextinguishable gaiety, his hard understanding of power, his instinct for innovation, his confidence in the ability of man to control what he has created, and, above all, from his indestructible faith in democratic institutions, his imperturbable trust in the strength of a free people, and his overflowing love of America.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now present Miss Leontyne Price. [Applause.]

Miss Leontyne Price sang "America the Beautiful" and the "Battle Hymn of the Republic."

The SPEAKER. In the Congress of the United States there is but one man presently serving who was in the Chamber of the Congress as a Member during those eventful and memorable first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt. The Chair recognizes at this time the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Senator from West Virginia.

□ 1130

Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, I want to thank our colleagues of the Senate and House who by legislation, without partisanship, have brought this event into being. And ladies and gentlemen, and all those who may be listening and perhaps watching throughout America, today we commemorate the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He, as we know now in memory, and we knew then, was a national leader who sustained and enlarged the legion of a free society. As a youth he knew the world of wealth and privilege. As our President he gave hope to the homeless, he created jobs for the jobless and fostered the meaning of social and economic justice in American democracy.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, more perhaps than any President, saved this Nation from being torn asunder by class conflict.

On March 4, 1933, President Roosevelt spoke to an anguished and anxious and a divided people. Two days later, to save the financial institutions of our Republic, he proclaimed a national bank holiday, closing all of the banks of our country. On the following Thursday, March 9, the first day of the new Congress, which he called into an emergency session—Mr. Speaker, I say this to you and to all those who perhaps want to have something recorded which is a fact—the House passed, without a rollcall, that legislation. The Senate, by a vote of 73 to 7, passed that legislation. The President signed it. It was the Emergency Banking Act, and it was all done in that one day.

Thus began the New Deal, an experiment in using an unorthodox means to modify, but also to preserve the orthodox institutions of a free economy.

In that second week of March 1933 we were faced with the most extreme test of national purpose and will since the Civil War. Lincoln saved a Union divided against itself. Roosevelt saved a Nation in disarray by calling forth a shared vision. In both crises the American people had the good sense to elect a leader who drew from the fundamental moral wellsprings of our Nation.

Today we also commemorate the good fortune and the continuing wisdom of our American democracy.

The Roosevelt vision became the New Deal, and the New Deal worked. The New Deal created jobs, not leaf-raking jobs as was said by some then and mistakenly even repeated today, but jobs reclaiming and planting thousands of acres of forests, building more than 11,000 schools and thousands of libraries and other public facilities.

In 1933 millions of Americans were working for bare subsistence wages. Almost a third of our labor force was not working at all. Only 1 in 10 farm families was served by electricity. Annual per capita cash income for farm families had dropped to \$48.

Now the New Deal brought hope where there was despair. It brought work where there was unwanted idleness. It brought unity of purpose where there was national chaos and much confusion.

The legislative reforms of the New Deal—I stress this—in banking and finance, in agriculture and conservation practices, in eliminating sweatshops and child labor and enabling working men and women to organize for collective bargaining, in creating some measure of security for the elderly, and in harnessing our rivers and generating electricity, that electricity going to farm and city homes alike, these reforms have changed the face of America and have been woven into the fabric of American life, and they will not be torn out.

Between 1921 and 1933 more than 10,000 banks closed their doors in this country, destroying faith in our most basic financial institutions.

On October 1, 1936, with the President running for reelection and campaigning in West Virginia, I was with him at the time he received a telegram from Washington. It informed him that for the first time in 55 years we had completed a full year without a single national bank failure. This was the President, I say advisedly, who was reviled as an enemy of capitalism.

In his first inaugural address the President declared his constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken Nation in the midst of a stricken world may require. Roosevelt did just that.

The actions of that first administration were not always guided by consistent economic theory. They were experimental. Yes; they were pragmatic. They were guided, however, by consistent moral purpose.

In his second inaugural address the President made that purpose explicit. He stated, "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we add more to those who have too little."

"In our personal ambitions"—he continued—"we are individuals, but in our seeking for economic and political progress as a nation we all go up or else we all go down as one people."

Those words ring with truth, and they should, and I do believe they serve as a beacon for the generations of all Americans.

Thank you. [Applause.]

□ 1140

The SPEAKER. We have as a Member of the House of Representatives a gentleman from the State of Florida, who represented that State in the 1930's in the U.S. Senate, during the time of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I am happy to present to you the Representative from the State of Florida, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER. [Applause.]

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, my colleagues in the Congress, distinguished guests, and my fellow countrymen.

If beneficent providence—and we are happy to observe that providence has always seemed to be kindly disposed toward America—brought forth George Washington to gain our independence, Thomas Jefferson to teach us democracy, and Abraham Lincoln to save our Union, surely that same beneficent providence on March 4, 1933, lifted up Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his great wife Eleanor to rehabilitate and restore America and to lead the free world to a great victory over a terrible despotism and tyranny. [Applause.]

The Nation upon which President Roosevelt looked that day was prostrate, almost, in body, and nearly broken in spirit. Not only were there millions unemployed, hundreds of thousands who had lost their homes and their farms to foreclosure; huts built in public parks were the only dwelling place for many more, with no food except what the soup kitchen would provide; and, perhaps even worse, groups of boys and girls out of school, hobnobbing from city to city like a pack of hungry wolves, seeking food, shelter, and a job.

But when that remarkable man began to speak to that audience standing in the snow around the inaugural platform and the millions listening over the radio in the land heard that

marvelous voice, when they received the contagion of his dynamic spirit, when they sensed his own courage and confidence, in their hearts was born a new faith and a new hope, and upon that new faith and hope a new America was born.

I personally believe that when the man Franklin D. Roosevelt realized the awesome responsibility he assumed as he took the oath of office that day, his natural strength of character, refined in the crucible of long suffering, made a new Franklin D. Roosevelt—a man of even new courage and faith and confidence.

As long as free men shall write history, a brilliant chapter in the story of man will be about Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, about their years in the White House, their leadership of America, their leadership of the free world, and the kind of a nation and the kind of a world they left as legacies to their fellow citizens now and of succeeding generations. [Applause.]

It was my privilege from 1936 until he passed away to have enjoyed the privilege, like many of my colleagues, of working with President Roosevelt. I came from the South that needed help, and here was a helping hand. I proudly embraced it. And what he did for our South we shall never forget; what he did for America will live forever.

But those of us who had the privilege of personal contact with the President know that it was an immeasurable experience; always, to come into his presence was a thrilling exercise. You never knew exactly what sort of an experience you would have because he was full of ingenuity, full of innovation, full of doing things in his own peculiar way.

I remember one instance when I went to see him about a project that a lot of my people down in Florida were pressing me about. The President evidently knew what I was coming to talk about. He satisfied his mind that he had already done all he could to help me in that matter. So when I went in and sat down at the President's desk, he said, "Hello, Claude, how are you?"

I said, "Fine, Mr. President."

I got my breath and started to talk about my project. He said, "Claude, have you ever read very much about Robert Livingston?" He said, "Robert Livingston was one of my wife's ancestors. He was one of our greatest Americans."

Well, I was nodding my head and listening respectfully as the President went ahead, telling me about Robert Livingston. But he went on and on, and I was still nodding my head and had not said a word about my project. Finally, after a little while—and all of the Members of Congress know what that means—Marvin McIntyre, the President's appointment secretary, came in and took his place, standing

there beside me. Well, of course, I knew that meant my time was up, and I had not said a word about my project. Well, I started to say, "Mr. President—" And by that time the cameramen were coming in, setting up their cameras, the press was pouring in and filling up the Oval Office, and in a little bit the President said, in his most ingratiating manner, "Claude, I am so glad that you came, I have enjoyed seeing you, come to see me again sometime." But I started to say, "But, Mr. President—" He said, "You know, I have got a press conference here now, Claude, and I cannot keep these people waiting. Thank you very much. I will see you soon."

Well, when I got back to my office I said, "Well, I did not make much progress on my project, but I am the best informed man on Robert Livingston there is on Capitol Hill." [Applause.]

There are three main legacies I venture to suggest which President Roosevelt left to our country and to the free world.

The first is: He showed by his own example and leadership that the Government of the United States belongs to the people of this land and that whenever their troubles and their disasters and their needs impel its use, it is available. It is the mightiest institution on the face of the Earth, and it can be a hand that will lift up the people if they call upon it.

There will be differences in the needs the people have for that Government, there will be differences in the attitude of those in charge of that Government toward the administration of such needs from time to time, but whenever the needs shall occur and be of sufficient gravity to make the demand proper and reasonable, you may be sure that the people of the United States will never let any President or any Congress forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Congresses that worked with him came to the aid of a suffering people when they needed and they called upon it for help. [Applause.]

And a second great legacy President Roosevelt left to us, and that is that compassion, genuine concern for one's fellow man should be in the heart of every man or woman who assumes the awesome responsibilities of public office.

I rather believe that President Roosevelt would not have objected to every person, after taking the oath of public office, being required to reread Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan, to be reminded that he was simply not to operate a cold machine, he was to help as far as would be proper and possible, people to live richer, healthier, and happier lives.

I remember a lady from Warm Springs saying when she was a girl in Warm Springs she always loved to see

the President whenever she could, and he often came to her home, and she said that as a girl she always looked upon the President as sort of a kind uncle.

Everywhere he touched, Roosevelt left the warmth of his generous spirit.

The third legacy is the place where he left America in center stage of world affairs. No more would another President have to pull a reluctant country to an acquaintance with its responsibilities against terrible despotism in the world. America, as Roosevelt left it, will be in center stage among the nations of the Earth, standing up for what is right, opposing what is wrong, and trying to build the institutions that will preserve the peace and the happiness of mankind.

So today we proudly commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of what they then called that fine baby boy to Sara Delano Roosevelt at Hyde Park. We proudly today attest our own respect, our admiration, and our affection for that great and good man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for his devotion to his God and his fellow man and his deep dedication to the service of both, and we leave him now again to sleep forever in honored glory with the lines spoken at Hyde Park by his old minister when he was laid to rest, the refrain of an old hymn:

Father, in Thy gracious keeping,
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. I now have the distinct honor of recognizing a man who has been called on by his country on so many occasions, when America has had emergencies and needs, because of his many talents, the former Governor of the State of New York, and our great senior statesman, whom we all love, the Honorable Averell Harriman.

The Chair understands that Governor Harriman has laryngitis. His remarks will be read by the lovely and beautiful Mrs. Pamela Harriman.

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, I ask your indulgence.

Although Franklin Roosevelt was 9 years older, I knew him well as a young man. Eleanor Roosevelt's brother was a classmate of mine in school. I liked Roosevelt enormously. He was genial and friendly, but it never occurred to me that he would be one of our most famous national leaders. I believe his victorious fight over polio gave him the strength of character to lead the Nation at the time of great need.

I knew he wanted to be Governor of New York. In fact, Alfred Smith, in 1928, in retiring from the governorship and running for the Presidency, called Roosevelt and asked him if he would run. Roosevelt felt he had not learned sufficiently to walk after his attack of polio. But Eleanor Roosevelt

took the telephone and told Smith, "Franklin will run."

When Roosevelt was elected President 4 years later, the country was in the most desperate economic situation of its history. He took hold of a nation deeply depressed, and in the famous "First 100 Days" gave hope. He took bold and untried action which gave a new spirit and confidence.

I came to Washington as a member of the Business Advisory Council which Roosevelt appointed. I was then asked to join the NRA. Uncontrolled competition had driven wages as low as 10 cents an hour and prices to bankruptcy levels. Industry was encouraged to join codes to fix prices and wages, with administration approval. Enthusiasm took the place of depression.

I remember 100,000 people marched up Fifth Avenue to celebrate.

The Supreme Court declared the NRA unconstitutional, as well as other acts, but later legislation legalized the best provisions, such as minimum wages and the right of workers to organize.

Years later, with the country strongly isolationist, Roosevelt feared the rise of Hitler's power in Europe and knew the United States had to play a role in world affairs.

In February 1941, Roosevelt sent me to England, then standing alone against the fury of Hitler's aggression. I was to report what Britain needed from the United States, short of America's entry into the war.

Thus Roosevelt authorized the first transpose program for Britain.

At the end of June, Hitler had attacked the Soviet Union and overrun the Soviet Army. Roosevelt met with Churchill at Newfoundland to discuss our mutual security and to proclaim the Atlantic Charter, out of which grew the United Nations. They sent Beaverbrook and myself to the Soviet Union to find out what help the Russians needed.

Roosevelt and Churchill supported the assistance the Soviets requested. The Soviet Union held out against Hitler's onslaught. Our food reached Leningrad before the end of the siege.

Stalin later acknowledged that the Soviet Union could not have survived without that help that Roosevelt sent.

Roosevelt met Stalin at Teheran in November 1943. At that meeting Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to invade the continent in the spring of 1944. Stalin agreed to launch an attack against the Nazi forces on the eastern front. There were 195 Nazi divisions in the east.

Stalin kept this agreement which led Roosevelt to believe that he could collaborate for keeping peace in the post-war world.

At the Yalta Conference in February 1945, the three leaders reached agreement on many subjects. Of particular significance was Poland, where it was

agreed that a government of national unity would be established with a pledge to hold "free and unfettered elections." Unfortunately, this agreement and others made at Yalta, Stalin failed to carry out.

Roosevelt was deeply disturbed and sent a sharp message to Stalin. Unhappily, President Roosevelt died a few days later on April 12.

It was Stalin's actions which brought on the cold war. Roosevelt has been criticized for being taken in by Stalin and for unwisely trusting him. Nothing is more unfair. If he had failed to try, Roosevelt would have been held responsible for the breach between us.

Stalin's carrying out of his military commitments had given Roosevelt reason to try to obtain political commitments.

Had Roosevelt lived, things might have been different, but Stalin was determined to expand the domination of the Soviet Union wherever possible.

In any event, I am sure that Roosevelt died with hopes still in his heart that he could lead the world into cooperation for peace.

The hope President Roosevelt offered abroad was as great as the vision he inspired at home. [Applause.]

The U.S. Marine Drum and Bugle Corps (the Commandants' own) presented a musical interlude.

□ 1200

The SPEAKER. We will now hear excerpts of addresses by F. D. R. narrated by his son, Jimmy, who served for so many years in this august body. Mr. James Roosevelt.

Mr. JAMES ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, ladies and gentlemen: You will forgive me if I am a little moved by this whole very historic occasion. This joint meeting of Congress here in the Capitol of the United States in a place my father often spoke from is a fitting and wonderful tribute to him.

My brothers, Elliott, Franklin, Jr., and John's lovely wife, Irene, and all of the Roosevelt family join me in thanking you, Mr. Speaker, and you, Mr. Vice President, and especially Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH and Representative CLAUDE PEPPER who were so important to President Roosevelt's time.

We are grateful, too, for the presence of Governor Harriman, Governor Carey, and to all of you who have joined here today, and if I may be permitted a personal greeting to my former colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle and to my continuing friends in the Senate, I would like, on behalf of all my family, to tell you how greatly we all are moved and appreciate it.

My father's era was an era of radio. Television had not yet invaded our political life. Though he occupied the

White House longer than any other American President, it was not his face or his figure that fixed his personality and character in the mind of the American people, it was his voice. On March 4, 1933, he was sworn in as the 32d President of the United States. Standing on the inaugural platform of the east steps of this building, his wasted legs held erect by steel braces, he addressed a nation facing economic despair, its banks closed and one-third of its work force without jobs.

F. D. R. recording: This is a day of national consecration and I am certain that on this day my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our people impels. This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory.

It was the beginning of a new concept in Government. He called it a "New Deal" for the American people—the first time that the national leadership of this country assumed the duty to help provide the conditions in which those who were deprived and those who suffered might find a chance for a decent life.

F. D. R. recording: I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-fed, ill-nourished. But it is not in despair that I paint that picture for you. I paint it for you in hope—because the Nation, seeing and understanding the justice of it, proposes to paint it out. We are determined to make every American citizen the subject of his country's interest and concern; and we will never regard any faithful, law-abiding group within our borders as superfluous. The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

He was never a man who harbored tired ideas: Large problems demanded creative solutions. Government should not be an alien force, but an intimate part in the lives of people. Some of his new programs would experience failure, but to him that was not as important as the trying.

F. D. R. recording: Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warm-hearted in different scales. Better the occasional faults of a Government that lives in a spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a Government frozen in the ice of its own indifference. There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. Of other generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

Mixed with his compassion was a fierce pragmatic mind. As friend and foe will attest, he thrived on political combat.

F. D. R. recording: These Republican leaders have not been content with attacks on me, or on my wife or on my sons. No, not content with that, they now include my little dog, Fala. Well, of course, I don't resent attacks, and my family doesn't resent attacks, but Fala does resent them. You know Fala is Scotch, and being a Scottie, as soon as he learned that the Republican fiction writers in Congress and out had concocted a story that I had left him behind on an Aleutian Island and had sent a destroyer back to find him—at a cost to the taxpayers of two or three, or eight or twenty million dollars—his Scotch soul was furious. He has not been the same dog since. I am accustomed to hearing malicious falsehoods about myself—such as that old, worm-eaten chestnut that I have represented myself as indispensable. But I think I have a right to resent, to object to libelous statements about my dog.

Ladies and gentlemen, I knew Fala well. He was almost a human dog, and he once told me in private that while he was Scottish, he above all was an American.

It was not easy to have a sense of humor in the 1940's. An ominous shadow had fallen over Europe. Hitler had annexed the Sudeten land, Austria, parts of Czechoslovakia. The German armies had invaded Poland. He, long before the American people, saw the danger and understood the consequences.

F. D. R. recording: We must be the great arsenal of democracy. For us this is an emergency as serious as war itself. We must apply ourselves to our task with the same resolution, the same sense of urgency, the same spirit of patriotism and sacrifice as we would show were we at war.

On January 6, 1941, America was at peace. The Battle of Britain had been won, but mainland Europe lay under the heel of the German Army. In the Old World, the flame of freedom had all but been extinguished. From the New World came a voice of hope.

F. D. R. recording: In these future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

□ 1220

Just over 41 years ago my father stood where I stand now and addressed a special joint session of Congress. The Nation listened, still

stunned by an unprovoked attack on American territory the day before. Three thousand American sailors and soldiers had been killed at Pearl Harbor and a country waited in silence to hear the words of its Commander in Chief.

F. D. R. recording: Yesterday, December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan. No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory. I believe that I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make it very certain that this form of treachery shall never again endanger us.

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory, and our interests are in grave danger. With confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God.

My father died on April 12, 1945. He was at Warm Springs, Ga., a place he loved, and where he frequently sought sanctuary from the terrible burdens of the American Presidency. The next day he was to deliver a speech on the occasion of the annual Jefferson Day Dinner. The words were written, but they would not be delivered by him. I would like to speak them now to you:

Today, as we move against the terrible scourge of war—as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world—the contribution of lasting peace, I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight edge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say: The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

The U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club rendered "The Navy Hymn."

The SPEAKER. The benediction will be given by Rev. Richard C. Halverson, Chaplain of the Senate.

The Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, L.L.D., D.D., offered the following benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. The Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you His peace, now and in the life everlasting. Amen.

The SPEAKER. In closing, please remain standing and join the Midshipmen Glee Club in singing "God Bless America."

The U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club, accompanied by the

Members and guests, rendered "God Bless America."

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting dissolved.

The honored guests, the members of the President's Cabinet, and the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments retired from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the proceedings in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt were concluded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that the House will continue in recess until the hour of 1:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER) at 1:30 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to permit the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland."

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE CONCERNING COMMEMORATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members be permitted 5 legislative days in which to entend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the centennial of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that today's joint session of Congress be a focal point of the celebration of the centennial of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was in this House, in addresses to joint sessions of other Congresses, that Presi-

dent Roosevelt announced some of the most important actions in the history of our country.

The word "crisis" is an example of a word the real meaning of which has become blurred through overuse. Today, occurrences which are the least bit out of the ordinary are labeled as crises. If you want a better understanding of what a crisis really is, consider the situation which confronted Franklin Roosevelt when he took office in 1933, and the events with which he had to deal in the years that followed. I believe that it is safe to say that no President has had to address problems of a magnitude greater than those addressed by Franklin Roosevelt.

When F. D. R. became President, this country was faced with an economic morass that threatened to destroy our social fabric. Millions of people were without work and millions more lacked food and shelter. Worst of all, the Great Depression had robbed many Americans of the belief that conditions could or would improve. Franklin Roosevelt not only sought to deal with those byproducts of the Depression which were most obvious, he also sought to transmute the American spirit with a measure of the optimism which so characterized his personality. In both efforts he succeeded.

The challenge of a truly depressed economy would have been more than enough of a challenge for most administrations. Roosevelt, however, had to deal with not only an unprecedented economic situation at home, but an equally unprecedented global conflict. The demands associated with instituting a recovery from the Depression and marshaling the effort necessary to win World War II were intense. The United States is fortunate that it had a President with the ability and the will to see the job through.

The Roosevelt years unmistakably changed the character of the Federal Government in our country. Roosevelt saw that national problems demand a national solution and that the implementation of that solution has to be a task of the Federal Government. He believed that government, especially the Federal Government, has a responsibility to all its citizens—rich and poor, young and old. The extent of that responsibility, and the manner in which it should be discharged, still colors our political debate. In a very real sense the shadow of Franklin Roosevelt is with us today.

Perhaps it could be best said of F. D. R. that he was leader at a time when leadership was a scarce commodity. A man of courage, he was unafraid to take on those with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. He was a man who, though personally restricted by a paralyzing illness, believed fervently in the necessity of action. The 12 years of his Presidency were char-

acterized by action on a scale few would have imagined and still fewer would have dared.

That the great experiment which our Nation began more than 200 years ago still endures is due as much to Franklin Roosevelt as to any other President in our history. The American people continue to be in his debt. ●

● **Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.** Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

In 1932 when Franklin Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency, the Nation was both economically and emotionally bankrupt—"Hoovervilles" of tar paper were sprouting on urban garbage dumps, jobless white-collar workers were peddling apples, and bread lines were becoming commonplace.

In his inaugural speech F. D. R. promised an aggressive approach to the crisis. And in his first 100 days a benchmark ever since for evaluating early Presidential performance—he shepherded 15 bills through Congress. He was a man of intense sympathy for the human suffering that was pervasive in the America of the 1930's. In meeting this challenge of immediate crisis he also was mindful of the need for preventing the recurrence of such an economic collapse. Accordingly, the early New Deal legislation: the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA), National Recovery Act (NRA), and Work Progress Act (WPA) all addressed the need for immediate recovery. While the later New Deal legislation: protection of the securities industry, fair labor standards legislation, and of course, social security, provided safeguards for our Nation's long-term health.

Despite his patrician background with education at Groton and Harvard, F. D. R. had a perceptive feel for the needs of less fortunate Americans. In fact, his ability to sense the needs of the common man whom he often called the forgotten man was quite keen. Yet while many of the Rooseveltian reforms were radical on their surface, they nonetheless blended well with such fundamental beliefs of American life as private sector strength and individual initiative.

F. D. R. was an innovative leader, one who broadened the scope of government from solely a servant of the rich to an advocate for individuals of all economic classes. The legacy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is a system of government responsive to the overall needs of America. ●

● **Mr. MARKS.** Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Joint Committee on Congressional Observances today, I am particularly pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on this, his centennial.

He was our President, communicator, domestic rallying point and wartime leader and Commander in Chief. No man in this century has had such a profound and lasting impact on America as we know it. He gave us persisting hope when we had none—nor any real reason to have any, other than his own burning belief in America's future.

Many of today's institutions which foster social and political stability and economic growth are direct results of the Roosevelt era and F. D. R.'s shaping of those years.

This is true not only in the United States but in much of the free world. The groping, pre-Keynesian political-economic theories which produced the beginnings of U.S. economic recovery in the midthirties are at work today in many places around the globe. The doctrines of national sovereignty and human rights contained in Roosevelt's foreign policy and found in the Charter of the United Nations, have served to influence, for the better, the course of developed and developing nation alike.

F. D. R. was one of the world's leaders at a point in time which was critical to the survival of civilization as we know it today. Threats to, and massive violations of, human rights were rampant. Standard bearers of this warring wave of repression and annihilation threatened the foundations of free societies like nothing ever witnessed on the planet.

F. D. R. was the true leader of Allied forces which preserved our world. Had he failed to gradually prepare the American people for what he knew was an inevitable conflict with Axis powers, the map of the world would be drastically different from what it is now—and with no guarantee the United States would have survived in a world dominated by flanking powers on both the Atlantic and Pacific.

In his first term, F. D. R. did have some trouble in preserving certain recovery programs like the NRA, which the Supreme Court rejected. He persisted, though, and the legacy of labor law protection, social security, minimum wages, securities regulation, and insured deposits are now integral parts of how Government helps regulate the economy and moderate cyclical swings.

That legacy is also the basis of the social contract which underpins the meaning of Government today—a contract between the American people and their Federal Government which helps assure social and economic justice for all. This President of the people was a man who fought to see included in the policy deliberations of his day those who previously were excluded. Entrenched forces of position and wealth fought against him but he prevailed and helped lay the groundwork for the betterment of those parts

of American society we had ignored for so many years.

Not for nothing were those pictures of Americans from all walks of life dissolving in tears as F. D. R.'s body moved up Pennsylvania Avenue back in April of 1945. They recognized in him that same gentle decency we honor today. A soldier said to a member of Roosevelt's Cabinet,

I felt as if I knew him. . . . I felt as if he knew me—and I felt as if he liked me.

Mr. Speaker, F. D. R. was and remains an inspiration to America and the world. My first, and most vivid political experience took place back when I was 10 years old. My father drove the family the 15 miles from Sharon, Pa., across the border into Youngstown, Ohio. F. D. R. was to appear and my uncle was providing the automobile in which F. D. R. was to tour the area. What a thrill for a youngster to meet and actually talk with the President of the United States—and what a President. The impression he made on me persists to this day. It stimulated my interest in politics and had some influence on my decision to run for Congress.

Today, the economy of the Nation is in trouble. We find ourselves with high inflation rates, high unemployment, and high interest rates. We have moved to cut Federal spending and the tax burdens of many taxpayers. I trust this economic experiment will prove successful. However, I also hope that should this experiment falter badly or fail and that we will have the wisdom, compassion, and economic common-sense to make sure that those individuals and families devastated by this experiment will find in the Federal Government of today that same measure of timely assistance provided during the four terms of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier in my remarks about the hope that F. D. R. gave a dispirited and hungry nation. Conditions now are clearly not nearly as bad as they were in the depths of the Great Depression. Yet, on an individual basis, many families are experiencing the loss of everything they spend years to build. It is my hope that we in the Congress and the administration will remember during this time of trial not only F. D. R.'s exorcism of pervasive national fear but his commitment to the working man—the common man—every man.

In his second inaugural address, F. D. R. said,

We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics.

I hope every American can take those words to heart. I should like to see a renewal of a spirit of comity abroad and the disappearance of a spirit of self-centered meanness which seems to be on the increase.

Mr. Speaker, I trust I have not been too guilty of discussing issues during proceedings I helped design to honor a great American. However, I do believe that perhaps nothing so honors the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as invoking his words and spirit as inspiration and guide to the Nation during this year of his centenary and the year of our discontent. ●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as we pause to day to honor the 100th birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt, it is only fitting that we reflect on the course this Nation has charted in the half century since his Presidency and look to where we are heading today.

Despite our present economic dilemma, we are still a wealthy nation and remain the industrial envy of the world. By combining abundant natural resources with progressive social policies, we have created a middle-class citizenry unequaled in history—undreamed of 50 years ago. Even though deep pockets of poverty and social injustice persist, we have molded a system with more affluence for more people than in any other time or place in the history of the world.

In my mind there is no doubt that the farsightedness of F. D. R. made this possible. With skill, wit, and boundless compassion for the common people of this Nation he set us on a social course that lifted us from the deadly grip of the Great Depression and guided us to unprecedented prosperity.

Today we are at a crossroads—a place in history where we must decide to turn back or continue moving ahead. We must decide in these Chambers whether to abandon F. D. R.'s heritage that has been so kind to us. That is the choice we are being asked to make—in the name of returning to the "good old days."

To some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the good old days were those before F. D. R. Before workers had the right to organize, before there were human wage and hour laws, before there was social security, before there were Federal job and relief programs, before there was unemployment compensation and, yes, even before the Federal Government protected savings deposits in banks.

When I hear some of my brothers pine nostalgically for these romantic days of the past, I wonder how many of them pause to reflect on the number of business successes we would have today were it not for the programs that Franklin Roosevelt first set in motion. Those daring entrepreneurs who regale us with stories about how they lifted themselves with their own bootstraps might do well to consider that they succeeded only because the Nation prospered as it never had before.

In their initial skirmishes with the Great Depression, F. D. R.'s brain-trusters saw production problems as the villain; the Nation was turning out too many goods. F. D. R. quickly spotted the error and concluded that the problem instead was at the consumer end. The need was to create more purchasing power.

One of the most remarkable qualities about F. D. R. was his flexibility. While he was deeply rooted in the old economics and bred into social traditions born of wealth, he was anything but doctrinaire. He fashioned social programs so that new economic theories would grow from them. Frequently his brain-trusters would inveigh against trying something new and untested. He would reply:

There is nothing to do but meet every day's problems as they come.

And always as he met those problems it was with the needs and welfare of all the people in mind.

From his pragmatism evolved the insight that by helping the poor and needy, the business community would also benefit.

This might be called the trickle-up theory of economics. It worked so well that it dragged millions of self-proclaimed, self-made successes to the top. We are now being asked to try again the trickle-down theory of economics, which has never helped anyone save the privileged class.

An early act of the New Deal was to protect the small homeowner from foreclosure. This it did. But it also provided relief for the mortgageholders and the bankers.

In the beginning, F. D. R. was deeply rooted to the notion that relief was a proper concern of States and communities. But he soon saw that the problems were not regional or local. He pushed through Federal grants, not loans, to the States and established the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to feed the hungry unemployed, recognizing that the States could not effectively deal with a problem so national in scope.

Neither did he rely on the States to provide jobs. Unemployment was a national problem. He realized that what happened in Mississippi or Maine would have ripple effects in New York and California. Then, as now, unemployment among the youth of the Nation was of specific concern. F. D. R. established the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I read in the newspapers that the States are laying off job counselors at employment offices because Federal funds have been slashed. As a result, job placements are down. There are not enough people to match skills with the few jobs that are still out there. I am certain that F. D. R. would not have been this shortsighted. He understood that the way to economic recov-

ery was through putting people to work—not giving a tax break to the rich.

We are being asked now to turn back the clock and create a "new federalism." This ignores what F. D. R. saw so clearly, that we must attack our social problems nationally with countrywide standards.

In our highly industrial, complex society the unfortunate are the victims of national circumstances. Their welfare, therefore, is a national responsibility. In many, if not most cases, the disadvantaged owe their plights to decisions made at the Federal level. We make decisions here in Washington on matters ranging from imports to crop plantings. When someone in Alabama or Kansas is adversely affected by these decisions, then we have an obligation.

Obviously the legislatures in Kansas or Alabama cannot set import or national agriculture policies. Neither should they be expected to shoulder the burden for the pain that some may suffer to promote the good of all.

For 50 years we have been proceeding on the premise that the Federal Government had awakened to a new sense of responsibility and community. Now we are being asked to take the road back.

I, for one, am not ready to take that trip. I remember only too well what is at the end of that road. It was a time of hurt and despair.

I thought we had chosen a better way, where we came to understand that Government's role is to help those who need help—not to enhance the fortunes of the rich. F. D. R. put it this way in 1933:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have enough. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

Franklin Roosevelt gave us hope—hope that all of us who wanted jobs would be able to have them, that those unable to work would be assisted compassionately and fairly and that we would have a measure of dignity in our old age.

I do not want to see that hope die, fade away, and be replaced with despair in the hearts of millions of poor and unemployed Americans.

In addressing the fears of the Great Depression, Roosevelt said that we needed plans "that build from the bottom up and not from the top down."

He said it well:

We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics.

I think it is time to rededicate ourselves to the wisdom of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his concern for the little people of America.

If he were alive today I like to think he would have something like this to say: "What is good for the forgotten

man at the bottom of the economic pyramid is good for General Motors."

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it does not seem possible that 100 years have passed since one of our greatest American leaders was born. But, it is true. We are gathered here to give recognition to the fact that Franklin Delano Roosevelt entered this world 100 years ago this week. Some might say well, so what? But I think those of us who have served in Government for many years, and have seen the results of his leadership exercised during the unprecedented three plus terms he served in office, could not let this day go past unnoticed.

America has produced many leaders. Some have been great, some have been mediocre, and some have, regrettably, not been leaders at all, but simply persons occupying a leadership position. However, in the case of Franklin Roosevelt, he was a true leader in every sense of the word.

Many of us remember well the days during the terrible depression of the thirties when we had men with college degrees standing shivering in winter on street corners selling pencils and apples for a nickel apiece, and long lines of men happy to accept a cup of watered-down soup and stale bread and call that their daily meal. The cause of the Great Depression is, of course, the subject of many, many pages of documentary and many learned treatises. I shall not say more here, as suffice it to say that it was real, and it was grim.

Franklin Roosevelt assumed the Office of the Presidency at the height of the depression. He had no guideposts left from previous administrations pointing the way to recovery. This was a depression without precedent in our history. He started our recovery by inspiring the American people to work together, to have confidence, and above all, warned them that the greatest thing they had to fear was fear itself. Many innovative programs followed in quick succession. By prohibiting the private ownership of gold, by closing banks until audits could be performed, and by placing stringent controls upon banking activities, he reestablished confidence in our currency. Once that was done, he proceeded with a long line of actions which I shall not take time to recount in detail here. Jobs were needed and created to put America back to work. Such things as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) put men to work enhancing what we now call our environment and our natural resources. We had the Public Works Administration (PWA), which put men to work on building public works projects, some still in use today. The FDIC and FSLIC were formed to protect the deposits of investors in banks and savings institutions. And then, just when recovery was on the upswing, men

were going to work, and the economy was moving forward, something much more ominous than even a terrible depression loomed on the horizon.

Many of us remember his fireside chats, when talking on the radio—and I must remind my younger listeners that there were no televisions at that time—Franklin Roosevelt established a bond between himself and the people. His wife Eleanor was constantly at his side and constantly in the public view, and even his little white dog Fala played a part in forming the Roosevelt image. And this image was necessary as a unifying focal point for our Nation, for in Europe the clouds of war were quickly gathering.

Roosevelt recognized that this Nation could not sit idly by and allow the dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini to solidify all of Europe under their control, including the British Isles. He saw that even though he did not wish to spend money on rearmament, he must do so. And he had the tremendous courage to take an extremely unpopular act—to call up National Guard units and, to institute the draft. These were unpopular measures, even at that time, for many did not perceive the threat as did Roosevelt. And, in fact, some famous Americans such as the hero Lindbergh, who first crossed the Atlantic by himself in an airplane, publicly spoke out in support of the German cause and stressed the might of German arms, counseling America not to become involved.

Another historic act was the bases-for-destroyers deal that Roosevelt made with Great Britain, giving a brave people across the sea 50 overage World War I four-stack destroyers in exchange for bases located on Caribbean Islands that formed a part of the British Empire. Some of these bases remain today for use both by our military and our space exploration efforts. And, when war did start for America, it came not from Europe as had been expected, but from the opposite direction with the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor. I do not believe that anyone who was living in those days can forget Roosevelt's speech to the Congress of the United States when he condemned the Japanese attack as a "day that will live in infamy."

Despite his crippling paralysis from youthful polio, Roosevelt was extremely active during the war years. He journeyed to meetings with leaders of other major wartime powers in Casablanca, Yalta, Tehran, and in the North Atlantic. Whether all of the decisions made at these meetings were the wisest ones is the subject of debate. But, and this is to his everlasting credit, he made decisions. He forged an alliance which saw the victory of Allied armies over those of the combined forces of Germany, Italy, Japan, and their lesser satellites. And,

above all, he preserved that which our country stands for, the freedom of our people to live in peace, to voice their opinions, and to elect their leaders.

President Roosevelt died shortly before World War II was terminated. He died before he could see all of his efforts come to fruition. But, I do not believe anyone here doubts that the work done by this great man has seen us in good stead in the years since his death. His domestic programs have been expanded, in some cases modified, and when they had outlived their usefulness some have been abandoned. And so, my colleagues, it is with that thought in mind that we are assembled here today, to honor a great man who did so much for his country and to renew our faith in the ideals for which he stood; and, to remember that, because of his leadership we are still enjoying the four freedoms which he so clearly identified in a speech on January 6, 1941—freedom from want, freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom from fear. It is a fitting tribute to a man who gave so much for so many. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ●

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we are not only asked to think about the life and times of F. D. R., but of the very meaning of democratic government in the United States.

It has been said that F. D. R. was more passionately loved and hated than any other American President. There can be no doubt as to his legitimate claim as one of the outstanding figures in the 20th century and, I think it fair to say, in American history.

So much happened during his four terms that it would be impossible for me to list the triumphs and the failures of this American leader.

What I would like to do, instead, is to quote a passage from a speech that is one of the most famous he ever made. It was made in Chicago, on July 2, 1932, on his acceptance of the nomination of his party to be its candidate for President.

Listen to what candidate F. D. R. said, before he became President:

I know something of taxes. For three long years I have been going up and down this country preaching that Government—Federal and State and local—costs too much. I shall not stop that preaching. As an immediate program of action we must abolish useless offices. We must eliminate unnecessary functions of Government—functions, in fact, that are not definitely essential to the continuance of Government. We must merge, we must consolidate subdivisions of Government, and, like the private citizen, give up luxuries which we can no longer afford . . .

By our example at Washington itself, we shall have the opportunity of pointing the way of economy to local government . . .

I propose to you, my friends, and through you, that Government of all kinds, big and

little, be made solvent and that the example be set by the President of the United States and his Cabinet.

That passage could easily have been slipped into last Tuesday's state of the Union message by President Reagan. No one would have known where it came from, since it reflects the policies of our current President.

Why do I raise this point? Only to demonstrate that throughout our history, basic principles remain the same. Big government is big government whether it is in the 1930's and 1940's or in the 1960's and 1970's. High taxes are high taxes, no matter who is President or what party is in power.

The words of Franklin Roosevelt, in his inaugural speech, remind us that some things never change. In that same speech he offered a program of relief—we would say welfare today—that would pay for itself. He never did manage to come up with such a program nor has any other President. But his ideal cannot be faulted.

Let us work together to see that F. D. R.'s stated ideals are put into practice today. That is the best tribute we can make to the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. ●

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, few would dispute that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was one of our Nation's greatest President's.

He was an exceptional leader, of exceptional vision and exceptional abilities. He led our Nation through one of the most trying periods: Through its most severe economic decline, its greatest war, and into its greatest age of economic prosperity and social justice.

It is appropriate that we pay tribute to President Roosevelt today in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of his birth, not only because of his enormous contribution to the America we now know, but because of the many challenges that are being made to the New Deal today.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the following article by Lloyd Bruno, which appeared in the Sunday, January 24, Sacramento Bee, be inserted for the RECORD. As Mr. Bruno so aptly points out, there is still much we can learn from F. D. R. and the New Deal.

**F. D. R.'s LIBERAL COMPASSION BECOMES
SUPPLY-SIDERS' SCAPEGOAT
(By Lloyd Bruno)**

Saturday will be the 100th birthday of FDR., a fact I am finding hard to accept, for to me FDR is still The President, much more alive than any of the nine worthies—more or less—who have come after him. Yet it is sober truth that Roosevelt now belongs to an age as remote from ours as Lincoln's was the year I was born.

For that reason it is hard to explain to those born since Roosevelt's death in 1945—and they are the majority of the population—what many of my own generation felt about him. Bright young persons who have studied about him in school take refuge in

"charisma," a trendy word for a quality they have learned to distrust, except, perhaps in rock stars and football players.

"Hitler had it," they will tell you, "and so did Jim Jones. If he'd wanted to, Roosevelt could have been as big a dictator as either, and maybe done a lot more harm."

They may be right about the dictator bit. When FDR took office erstwhile "progressive" thinkers like Shaw and Steffens were crying up dictatorship as the sure route to social salvation, and the wife of the legendary Lindbergh assured us it was "the wave of the future."

That was when Hitler, crazed with heady brew of Aryanism, was erecting the menacing structure of the Third Reich on the ruins of the Weimar Republic. Mussolini, the sawdust Caesar, was busy reviving the grandeur of imperial Rome and making the trains run on time. And Joe Stalin was jailing his opponents and shipping the kulaks off to the Siberian tundra, in the holy name of the proletariat.

Yet FDR apparently felt no temptation to follow their example, though in March 1933, both Congress and the people were in the mood to grant him unlimited power had he asked for it. He believed, however, that traditional American democracy, with all its notorious shortcomings, was a safer refuge in times of crisis than any of the versions of despotism then being hawked under fancy ideological labels.

Perhaps I am naive, but I feel that FDR believed in democracy because he was not only a good man, but also a happy one. He thoroughly enjoyed life, and wanted his fellows to do likewise. In this respect he was poles removed from the dictators—sour, hate-ridden bundles of envy and resentment, every man jack of them. Neither had FDR anything in common with the communist or fascist intellectuals, whose fierce assault on democracy was fueled by festering grievances and a longing for revenge upon society.

FDR radiated delight in living. He was not ascetic and, I fear, no saint. The mad Hitler, who shaved with cold water, spurned sensual pleasures and looked with icy contempt on the ordinary man's love of creature comforts. Not so FDR; he reveled in the good things of life, right down to Old-Fashioned cocktails, which he mixed with surpassing expertise. Finding deep satisfaction in being alive, he wished the same boon for all. I think the basis of his belief in democracy was as simple as that—and as profound.

Much has been made of Roosevelt's patrician background, and it can be said that the Hudson River squirearchy to which his family belonged comes as near to aristocracy as this country can show. Yet Roosevelt was an aristocrat in the Jeffersonian mold: He sided wholeheartedly with the plain people, and in no spirit of condescension whatsoever. His sympathies were genuinely with "one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished."

For this stand, those he castigated as "economic royalists" labeled him "traitor to his class." This charge FDR always treated with contempt, for he considered himself far above the tycoons, fat cats and pious money-grubbers. True, he lived graciously off a modest fortune, but he dismissed the singiminded and insatiable pursuit of profits as a goal unworthy of a gentleman. He had, he once said, no objection to moneymaking, but he could not understand why those who devote their lives to it can never get enough.

I agree, FDR was fortune's favorite, born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He was

sent to Groton, taken on expensive tours of Europe and emerged painlessly from Harvard with a "gentleman's C." He was a playboy and, I greatly fear, something of a ladies' man. Had he been living in Russia in 1917, Lenin would have had him shot as the pampered pet of privilege.

Yet how much more compassionate and appreciative of the common man's hard lot than the dour Hoover, the self-congratulatory Nixon, the smugly moralistic Reagan, all of whom, like Dickens' Bunderby, "made it" by hard work, and can see no reason why anyone, by earnest endeavor and ceaseless prayer, cannot emulate their example. I cannot help thinking of a line of Edgar Lee Master, "Beware, O republic, of the man who rises to power on one suspend-er."

Officially, of course, FDR's stock is low right now. The current preacher from the bully pulpit attributes all our woes to fifty years of waste, mismanagement and extravagance, initiated by—you've guessed it. Had FDR practiced supply-side, trickle-down, as expounded by Andrew Mellon, today we'd be solvent, moral and greatly loved, with the wicked Commies abjectly cringing at the mere mention of our name.

That sort of blather makes me think of a chipmunk trying to claw down Mount Shasta. The latest poll of 50 or so distinguished historians rated Roosevelt just below Lincoln and Washington.

"The test of our progress," Roosevelt said, "is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Let Ronald Reagan ponder that, and consider whether it is not time to quit using FDR as his scapegoat, and instead to make him his model. ●

● **Mr. BINGHAM.** Mr. Speaker, today's joint session commemorating the F. D. R. centennial was a magnificent occasion. Franklin D. Roosevelt was indeed one of our very greatest Presidents and is well-deserving of celebration on this 100th anniversary of his birth.

As a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt centennial committee I want to express my appreciation to Peter Kovler of Chicago, chairman of the committee, for his work in arranging so many of the centennial activities. To borrow a phrase from today's Los Angeles Times, Peter Kovler was "the sparkplug" of the F. D. R. centennial and, in fact, its sine qua non.

I attach a piece on Kovler from today's Washington Post.

HOMAGE TO A HERO

PETER KOVLER AND THE FDR CENTENNIAL

(By Ann L. Trebbe)

His office is bare. There is no typewriter, no portrait of a smiling wife, no pictures on the walls, no books on any shelves. There isn't even a stack of paperwork waiting to be done. A desk and a phone sit alone in a room in the Smithsonian's Museum of Natural History.

But that's all he needs, says 29-year-old Peter Kovler, breaking into a laugh to assure you he likes it that way.

As Saturday, the 100th birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, nears, Kovler, chairman of the National FDR Centennial Committee, executive director of the Congress-

sional Committee for a Joint Congress and heir to the Jim Beam fortune, has seen his days become filled with a final frenzy.

A typical recent day went in part like this: 8:45 a.m. He's having breakfast at home with his wife, Judy. The phone rings. It's a committee member to discuss an FDR centennial problem.

He gets to his office. . . . A woman in San Mateo County, Calif., is on the line saying she saw a small item in a San Francisco newspaper about the FDR centennial. She wants to organize some Democrats to spend the evening together. How should she do it?

Off to Capital Hill for a meeting, lunch and press conference with Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) and Sen. Jennings Randolph (D-W.Va.).

Middle of the afternoon, working from the office of Rep. Sidney Yates (D-Ill.). He gets through a call to the secretary in his Chicago office and dictates a letter about celebrations in Miami, Denver, San Francisco and Chicago.

Kovler's friends, when they are able to slow him down, jokingly call him Franklin. A playwright friend recently gave him an FDR coloring book. His wife has started a scrapbook.

"FDR is full-time now," Kovler says earnestly, leaning over a ketchup-drenched hamburger he ordered at lunch. With the next bite, he tallies the count of FDR-related phone calls on an average day. "Dozens," he decides.

Last summer when Kovler, who was born seven years after FDR died, began to wonder what was being planned to recognize the anniversary of Roosevelt's 100th birthday, he found out that virtually nothing was being planned. The former Department of Commerce speechwriter was shocked and decided to start something himself. Soon he found himself head of the whole centenary project.

There's no doubt that Kovler's admiration of the former president got him the job. But there must be some reason a nice-guy-from-Chicago-too-young-to-have-been-there is in the midst of a Roosevelt hoopla like this. He says his parents didn't hang FDR's portraits above the mantle. Bread lines were never a part of his life, and although his father talked about FDR and his mother cried when he died, he was just one among many other heroes in the household. Patriotism is his defense.

"There's nothing wrong with patriotism," Kovler says, even though he describes growing up at a time when patriotism was apt to be mocked.

"I just assumed he was everyone's hero," Kovler says, his widening blue eyes a perfect match with his faded jeans. "Don't you think?"

Everyone's hero or not, Congress appropriated \$225,000 to fund the commemorative festivities, including the Smithsonian's observance, which in size will be second only to its Bicentennial celebration. But in terms of presidential commemoratives, according to Kovler's research, it doesn't come close to Herbert Hoover's in 1974 when \$7 million was spent.

"A considerable amount," says Kovler, his bushy brown mustache hovering over every word. "And a considerable amount for a figure I think everyone would say paled in comparison—to put it mildly—to Franklin D. Roosevelt."

But Kovler is more than pleased with the celebration plans, which include lectures, films, a three-hour television documentary and numerous exhibits, especially since he

found out it usually takes three to five years to properly coordinate a tribute of this scale. He's convinced it will be a celebration fit for a president.

"It's common knowledge that Roosevelt saved the nation through two of the most major crises of the century," Kovler says, the hamburger long gone, but the FDR talk still flowing, "and that he was to America like Churchill to England, like Lincoln to the 19th century."

"I would like people to remember that there is nothing criminal about government," Kovler says. "Most people think that now, somehow, the government is the devil's tool, and I think you can show by teaching history, this history—the New Deal—that government is not the devil's tool."

Kovler walks out onto the snowcovered sidewalk. He stops and turns around, an envelope tucked under his arm.

"Do you know where the Federal Express office is?"

Peter Kovler's got some last-minute FDR mail-outs. ●

● **Mr. MOAKLEY.** Mr. Speaker, January 30 marks the 100th birthday of one of the finest and most compassionate Presidents in American history—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is appropriate that we honor him at a time when this Nation is in such desperate need of a leader of his caliber and vision. I feel it necessary for Americans to recommit themselves to the ideals of F. D. R.—especially, seeing how we now have a President who is working overtime to destroy many of the great and essential programs that were created under the Roosevelt administration.

Franklin Roosevelt had an admiration for the common man, a rare and valuable trait amongst politicians. He once said:

We are poor indeed if this nation cannot afford to lift from every recess of American life the dread fear of the unemployed that they are not needed in this world.

Roosevelt realized that Americans are tough and determined individuals who want to work and want to play a part in making this Nation great. He also recognized that there are those—the elderly, the poverty stricken, the less fortunate—who are in dire need of Government assistance. We should all be thankful that F. D. R. did not look upon the needy as shift and lazy—unlike some of the new rightists who have invaded this city. If he had, there may not be unemployment compensation or social security. Roosevelt taught us the importance of caring. Let me say, despite what we are hearing from the present administration, there is nothing wrong with caring about others.

In the foreign policy arena, F. D. R. was a master. He was free from the cold war mentality that has plagued every President since him. He believed in conducting American foreign policy in a positive manner in which we would remain loyal to our own values while remaining tolerant of different values.

Mr. Speaker, the editors of the New Republic magazine have written an excellent tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt entitled "The Roosevelt Century."

I submit the article at this point in the RECORD:

THE ROOSEVELT CENTURY

January 30 is the centenary of the birth of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The nearly 37 years since he died have not been a hospitable time for American icons, past or present. So it is remarkable that there has been no dimming of his luster. He continues to be large in a way that none of his successors (and only a few of his predecessors) can begin to match. He is still the smiling demigod in the photograph on the following page—jaunty and confident, an infinitely reassuring father, a warm sun radiating blissful hope. His biographers—Schlesinger, Burns, Freidel, Leuchtenberg—take his greatness as a given, and indisputable fact that needs no defending, only elucidating. Some revisionist historian may yet try to revise him down to size, but the popular verdict is not likely to change. That verdict puts him on a par with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln as a creator of American democracy. Franklin D. Roosevelt is the 20th century's addition to the roster of Founding Fathers.

At the beginning, enlightened opinion expected little from the squire of Hyde Park. The editors of this journal were among those he gradually, but decisively, won over. "No doubt many of Mr. Roosevelt's progressive supporters think his program really embodies a 'new deal,'" they wrote on the eve of the 1932 election. "But it embodies nothing that reaches to the heart of the existing system." A vote for Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate, was urged instead. By 1936 the editors were recommending a vote for Roosevelt only if the contest with Landon looked close, and for Thomas (or the Communists' Earl Browder!) if FDR seemed to have it in the bag. But in 1940 and 1944 the magazine didn't bother to wait for the campaign. Both times it endorsed the President as soon as he was renominated. FDR had made himself the indispensable man—and to see how he did it, one need only look at the America he inherited and the America he left behind.

In 1932 the United States was bankrupt in every way. With millions out of work and unsheltered from the bitter winds of depression, the official ideology of the government in Washington was a mixture of self-deluded Babbity and paralyzed despair. Abroad the country counted for little. Wilson's internationalist legacy had been wholly squandered. (Militarily, the U.S. was very far from being No. 1; shortly before FDR's inauguration, General Douglas MacArthur, then Army Chief of Staff, rated it at No. 17.) When FDR died, on April 12, 1945, the Allies were on the verge of victory over Hitler, and the United States was indisputably the most powerful nation in history. At the root of that victory was something deeper than military strength. The country had transformed itself, under President Roosevelt's leadership, into a working and workable democratic society, with the means and the will to provide its citizens with a decent life. Did the New Deal "reach to the heart of the existing system"? Perhaps not. But before 1932, that system didn't have a heart. FDR gave it one.

Many of the fights that stirred such passions in Roosevelt's day seem trivial today.

The NRA's blue eagle, the court-packing plan, the supposed danger of a third term—these are now as quaint as an older ration book. And FDR's moral vision was sometimes cloudy: witness his internment of Japanese-Americans at the start of World War II and his failure to grasp the full horror of the Nazi atrocity against European Jewry.

Looking back, though, what most stand out today is the extraordinary creativity of his stewardship. Institution after institution that he helped bring into being—Social Security, unemployment insurance, the modern labor movement, the minimum wage—permanently changed American society for the better. Were some New Deal programs (such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which FDR thought would protect bad banks along with good ones) passed with only the reluctant consent of the President? No matter. Roosevelt created the New Deal's exhilarating atmosphere of fearless experimentation, and Roosevelt deserves the credit for its accomplishments.

In foreign policy FDR, who had campaigned for the League of Nations as the Democratic vice-presidential candidate in 1920, came to office as a member of neither the internationalist nor the isolationist camp. But he gradually educated the public to the need for a strong, active American role in the world. In his willingness to act he was always ahead of public opinion. He saw, when others did not, that liberty and democracy could not survive in America if they were expunged abroad. He understood that moral purity was not sufficient for liberty's defense against aggressive totalitarianism. Against massive opposition at home, he urged military preparedness and furnished the Allies with weapons with which to defend themselves and our common interests. It was thanks to his foresight that what he called "the American people in their righteous might" were as ready as they were for war when war came; and it is part of his legacy that since the war ended the American people have not again been seriously tempted—until our time, that is—by the kind of isolationism that he had inherited. When Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, FDR knew that "the peace of all countries is in danger." He proceeded to dismantle the structure of America's historic neutrality. He would have known what to do with reference to Poland today.

This wordly, happy man, so utterly without unctuous piety, was in fact a spiritual leader. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," he said—and the country nearly wept with relief. He never entertained the slightest doubt that he could make the United States a stronger, more decent place. Writing in the New Republic on July 22, 1940, Hamilton Basso, with startling prescience, caught the essence of Roosevelt's contribution as well as anyone ever has, before or since. He wrote:

"FDR's place in history is secure, but only if the opponents of republicanism do not write the future history books. And here, in this qualification, we come to what may well be the true greatness—perhaps the accidental greatness—of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He emerges, out of the fog of a stormy time, as one of the great spokesmen of democracy—giving new articulation to those old and simple ideas which, if democracy is to survive, must truly be weapons.

"He came to the Presidency in a black moment of a black, black time. Democracy, as a form of government, was being laughed

at and derided. Many of the intellectuals now loving it so noisily were . . . writing of America as jungle, America as wasteland, America as washed-up. There was a red dawn over Moscow that had not yet turned out to be merely a reflection of the bombed towns and burning villages of Finland and, at home, the desperate and the hungry were listening to Huey Long.

"It was then, in 1933, that Franklin D. Roosevelt began to carry the country forward to the modern stage of democratic realization—to the point, that is, where the immediate and direct interest of the government in the welfare of all its citizens is also recognized as a democratic principle."

That principle, it need hardly be added, is precisely what is under attack on the hundredth anniversary of Roosevelt's birth. It only enriches the irony that the leader of that attack is the man who, by quoting this greatest of Democrats in his acceptance speech to the 1980 Republican convention, confirmed the place of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the pantheon of nonpartisan American heroes. We have no quarrel with that. Ronald Reagan's astute decision to drape himself in the Roosevelt mantle was a backhanded tribute to the breadth of FDR's appeal and the universality of FDR's legacy. But it was also an audacious piece of political larceny—one that made skillful use of the superficial resonances between the two men. Like FDR in 1932, Reagan in 1980 was elected more for who he wasn't than for who he was. Like FDR, Reagan faced an incumbent, an uninspiring engineer-President, in a time of economic distress. Like FDR, Reagan offered a politics of expansiveness, hope, and possibility against a politics of scarcity and resignation. And, like FDR, Reagan as President began his term with a dynamic flurry of proposals for economic recovery, demonstrating a masterful sway over Congress in the process, and promising deep and lasting change in the relation of the American government to the American people.

But the similarities only make the differences, which are far more meaningful, stand out in sharper relief. None of FDR's successors have been his peers, so perhaps it is unfair to hold any of them to his standard. But Mr. Reagan, the "Republican FDR," has invited the comparison himself; and he has lately provided a pertinent text in a remarkable public television interview with Ben Wattenberg. Because it was broadcast on Christmas night—at the beginning of the one week each year when the press and public are at their least attentive—it passed almost unnoticed. In the interview, Mr. Wattenberg asked Mr. Reagan to explain his journey from New Deal Democrat to conservative Republican.

"The President. Well, it's true that when I cast my first vote, at age 21, it was for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, his first election. And it's true, if I look back, that—because, remember, this was the depths of the Depression. I got out of school and sought my place in the world of work in 1932, when the government was putting ads on the air, on radio, urging people not to leave home looking for work because there was no work. Stay home and wait and the government would do something for you. I got a job. I didn't stay home. But I don't mean it wasn't real—the problem, 25 percent unemployment.

"Mr. WATTENBERG. This was the radio announcer job?

"The President. Yes. Now, I think in that whole era, it was a great traumatic experi-

ence for the nation, and so we had a kind of thought that we had a sick patient and medicine must be applied. But the Roosevelt that I voted for had promised to cut federal spending by 25 percent, had promised to return to the states and local communities authority and autonomy that had been unjustly seized by the federal government. . . .

"Mr. WATTENBERG. And you supported him during all those years, right?"

"The PRESIDENT. Oh, yes, and there was no question about his being a great war leader for this nation. And I think all of our attention turned to that. But, in the meantime, my own analysis is that people attracted to government and to government positions in those years, in many instances, did not view the medicine as temporary. If you remember, I was assailed during the campaign for saying that many of the New Dealers actually espoused what today has become an epithet—fascism—in that they spoke admiringly of how Mussolini had made the trains run on time. In other words, they saw in what he was doing a planned economy—private ownership, but government management of that ownership and that economy. Ickes, Harold Ickes, in his book, said that what we were striving for was a kind of modified form of communism. Well, I don't believe that that was really in Roosevelt's mind, and I think that, had he lived, and with the war over, we would have seen him using government the other way. Roosevelt at one time made a statement that the federal government had to get out of the business of—we didn't call it welfare then, we called it relief. But, as he explained, that the federal government was not the proper agency for that, and that the manner in which it was being done was demoralizing to the people that you were trying to help.

"Mr. WATTENBERG. I'm a little bit turned around here."

Well, so are we—and so, dizzyingly, is the history of the New Deal. It scarcely seems possible that Mr. Reagan so profoundly misunderstands the era in which he came to maturity. One of the things that era teaches is that the essential difference between democracy and tyranny lies not in whether public or private entities manage the economy but in who owns, as it were, the government itself. Does a blend of private ownership and public planning really constitute fascism or communism? If so, then the only question is which of America's allies have gone fascist and which have gone communist—to say nothing of America itself.

Apart from the fractured political science, the interview illuminates two facets of President Reagan's mind and spirit that make a powerful contrast with President Roosevelt's. One has to do with empathy, the other with ideology.

Mr. Reagan understands perfectly that a business executive might need a government tax incentive to encourage him to invest. But he cannot see how a government loan to a college student from a lower-middle-class family or a nutrition allotment to a pregnant woman or a newborn child can be anything but demoralizing. He divides the country into producers and parasites, and the latter category includes not only those who for some reason cannot follow his example ("I got a job") but also the government itself. Roosevelt saw democratic government as the collective instrument by which the whole society could renew itself; for Reagan, that is the province only of the owners of wealth, and, grudgingly, of local authorities. Roosevelt, who began life with

much, could empathize with those who had little. Reagan reverses the equation. Roosevelt, to use an old-fashioned phrase, had a social conscience. Reagan seems to have none.

Mr. Reagan is right that Governor Roosevelt, in his first campaign for the presidency, promised to reduce the federal budget. Indeed, FDR's initial program of massive cuts in government spending and massive relief for the jobless was an early instance of voodoo economics. But he was not wedded to any one approach. His blithe disdain for dogma, the despair of some of his advisers, was one of the keys to the success of his Administration. His was an ideology of values, not of mechanisms. During the first campaign, even as he was calling for balanced budget, he let his principled pragmatism shine through. "It is common sense to take a method and try it," he said. "If it fails, admit it frankly and try another. But above all, try something." And when the first New Deal, the New Deal of NRA and managed scarcity, failed to cure the Depression, out it went, and in came the second New Deal, the New Deal of social reform. Mr. Reagan, too, was elected partly out of a widespread sense that he would "above all, try something." But he seems to have only a single something to try. Last week after new figures showed the unemployment rate rapidly approaching 9 percent this was his lame defense of his economic program: "I don't know any other way to do it." He is a prisoner of an ideology—the wrong ideology at that.

The Democrats, willy-nilly, are FDR's true political legatees. They must build a house of their own in which to hang his portrait, and we have no doubt that in time they will. But for the moment they are like the listless heirs of some departed magnate, picking sadly over the threadbare furniture in a cobwebby mansion. They are shaken by the Republicans' success in building a coalition of the haves and the almost-haves—and they deserved to be shaken. As they grope for answers, their duty—the duty of all of us who share their values—is not only to defend Roosevelt's legacy but also to separate the wheat from the chaff in the Democratic programs that came after the New Deal. The successes of the New Frontier and the Great Society, from Medicare to the space program, were those that engaged the imaginations, and interests of the entire society. Where there were failures, political or substantive, they mostly came in programs that divided the country into its economic and ethnic components and then proceeded to "target" the benefits.

The great lesson that Franklin D. Roosevelt's career holds for his political descendants is to be found in the inclusiveness and universality of his social vision. The Democrats will err if they waste too much time genuflecting to the "private sector"—or any sector. Nor will they gain much for themselves or the country if they put too much stock in "compassion." Compassion is an excellent private virtue, but in public affairs it is too readily jettisoned, even by people of good will, if it is seen to clash with a broader common interest. The Democrats must learn to respect the real discontents of the American middle class—the fear of crime, the disgust with lousy schools, the creeping sense of social and economic disintegration. There are signs that the Democrats are beginning to do so. Finally, the Democrats must learn to unite the potential strength of the American underclass with that of the hard-pressed working people who are cur-

rently underwriting the Reagan Administration's experiment in economic royalism. These are the people who abstain in growing numbers with each succeeding election. They are the present equivalent of FDR's Forgotten Man. The Democratic Party can bring them back only with a political creed that stresses their potential as functioning members of a larger society, not as marginal objects of charity. But one-third of the American nation is no longer "ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished." That was FDR's achievement. Roosevelt's heirs will conduct themselves as if this advance was never made at the peril of turning the Democratic Party into a permanent minority party and, at that, largely a party of the minorities.

The next great wave of political and social reform in this country, we hope, will understand the value of human capital, not just the kind that buys machines; it will explore the possibilities of democracy in the workplace, not just in the electoral arena; it will look for ways to limit bureaucracies, not just protect them; it will use equity as a spur to productivity, not just as a tool of distributive justice. Roosevelt's America was open and unfinished; so is ours. More important than any particular scheme, more important even than any particular goal, will be the largeness of democratic spirit that was Franklin D. Roosevelt's distinctive and effortless gift. ●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birth. F. D. R. gave hope to a nation crushed by economic depression and world war and led it to renewed greatness. His New Deal for America has provided the basic structure of government for half a century. Indeed, many of us grew up knowing only F. D. R. as President; today, administrations come and go, but the long shadow cast by F. D. R. remains.

Today's joint session of Congress in President Roosevelt's honor is very appropriate, and I am pleased to have the privilege to attend. I hope that this centennial celebration will not only remind us of F. D. R.'s greatness, but will also spur the construction of the F. D. R. Memorial. There can be no better time than now to erect a fitting memorial to F. D. R.'s distinguished career as a public servant.

On Monday, January 25, the Senate Rules Committee reported Senate Joint Resolution 95, which authorizes the construction of the F. D. R. Memorial. This positive step brings us closer to the day when the F. D. R. Memorial Commission can bring its work to a successful end. As House Member of the F. D. R. Commission, I am well acquainted with the chronic delay that has afflicted efforts to build a memorial to F. D. R. The F. D. R. Memorial Commission was created by Congress in 1955, yet after 26 years and half a million dollars, we still do not have a memorial. Though many have faulted the F. D. R. Commission for this foot dragging, Congress bears a share of the blame. Numerous proposals have been put forward, and all have been refused,

except of course, the most recent proposal which has been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Park Service, and the Commission on Fine Arts. Only the Congress has thus far failed to move.

On the eve of the 100th anniversary of F. D. R.'s birth, we have before us a suitable memorial proposal. I hope this auspicious timing will prompt the Congress to authorize funding for the F. D. R. memorial as soon as possible.

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who served as our Nation's Chief Executive during the years 1933-45, longer than any President before or since. I was privileged to work in his campaigns of 1936, 1940, and 1944.

Few men more profoundly affected the course of American public life than Franklin Roosevelt. He won a place unique in the hearts of our people and in the annals of the Nation. He earned that place by force of moral character, by boundless energy on behalf of the common good, and by holding before men and women the example of leadership untainted by selfish advantage.

The respect and esteem in which he was held reflected the sentiments of the Nation as a whole and, indeed, of people's good will throughout the world. To millions across the globe he embodied the ideals and aspirations of American democracy as very few men or women in this or any other century.

The record of F. D. R.'s service to State and Nation, service which continued in the midst of serious illness, is an impressive one. His political idealism found expression with his first surprising victory in a New York State election for State senator in 1910, at the age 29, from a district which had been dominated by Republicans for over 50 years. During World War I, he served as President Wilson's Assistant Secretary of the Navy, where he gained valuable foreign policy experience in Europe, and in 1920 he became a candidate for Vice President on the Democratic Party ticket headed by Gov. James M. Cox of Ohio. The candidates campaigned in favor of U.S. membership in the newly formed League of Nations and on other progressive innovations, but the country was not ready for such expressions of political idealism at that time.

Although tragically stricken with polio in 1921, Roosevelt's courage and fortitude continued to inspire progressive Democrats all over the Nation, and at the urging of Al Smith, the Democratic Party's Presidential candidate in 1928, despite the need he felt to continue his treatments for polio in Warm Springs, Ga., he ran for Governor of New York where he won the

election despite the failure of Smith to carry the State in his own election campaign. As Governor, he established a program of unemployment compensation, the first for that State, and successfully fought for legislation which reformed the public utilities, the State prison system, and initiated an old-age pension program. He won reelection in 1930 by a record vote.

Elected to the Presidency in 1932, by a sad and desperate Nation in the depths of the Great Depression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt maintained his good cheer and optimistic image and remained inexhaustibly hopeful and confident, grounded in a deep love for America and a commitment to freedom and dignity for all her citizens. Shortly before he took office in 1933, a banking panic began which compounded the misery of millions of citizens who had already lost their jobs, their homes, or their farms because of the national economic collapse. He initiated programs on behalf of average Americans, the "forgotten man," as he called them, designed to improve the economic condition of the country.

The many fundamental reforms of our Nation's economic and social systems, called the New Deal by President Roosevelt, were seen by him as the "use of the authority of government as an organized form of self-help for all classes and groups and sections of our country." He vigorously led Congress in the enactment of laws to reform the banking system, establish the right of collective bargaining, and create jobs and housing. He led in the enactment of the Social Security Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as well as the laws establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps and many other agencies to assist in the financial recovery of all Americans.

The era of the New Deal was a remarkable and brilliant era in the history of democracy because the programs of the New Deal involved each and every American. Franklin Roosevelt never lost that zeal and that fire as a champion of all the people by espousing that it is good and it is right for people to share in the wealth of America, because he believed that a productive citizen is what makes a democratic country like ours strong. He firmly believed that each citizen who has produced for America and who contributed to the wealth of America must be remembered by America and not abandoned just because they fall ill or their working years are over.

Franklin Roosevelt's character and career alike were a vindication of democracy at a time marked by new forms of tyranny, political disillusion, and small-minded partisanship. No other politician proved to be so durable, so effective, and so productive in

both war and peace. Few leaders in our history made so many contributions to the well-being of our beloved country, and President Roosevelt's high standards, his tender and compassionate interest in people, and his inspiring example of creative accomplishment shall live forever in the hearts and minds of all people.

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to be a Member of Congress on this occasion when we pay tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt—one of this Nation's most important Presidents and clearly one of the most enduring of all figures in American history.

It was 1882, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was born in the beautiful community of Hyde Park, N.Y. He was a man who loved New York like few others. He served with great distinction as its Governor. Yet it was this position he was elected to after that—President of the United States where Roosevelt truly established himself as an American legend. He served in the office longer than any other President. He began his Presidency during the waning days of the depression and ended it with our triumphant victory in World War II.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt for many Americans is the only President they remember—for he had such an enormous influence over everyday life in America from 1932 until 1945. He took a nation out of despair and gave it hope. He transformed a nation and its sagging spirit to one with renewed confidence.

How do you pay an appropriate tribute to a man who served almost 4,000 days in the most difficult job in the world? How do you pay tribute to a man who guided us out of the depression and led us to victory in World War II when our very freedoms were challenged as never before? Today, we do our small share to honor a great American Franklin D. Roosevelt. I hope the day is not too far off when an appropriate memorial is placed in our Nation's Capital similar to those which honor this Nation's other great Presidents, Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson. We should make this a goal of the 97th Congress.

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for generations of today to understand the utter hopelessness into which the people of our Nation fell at the onset of the Great Depression. While we certainly have economic problems, the growing recession most prominent among them, we now address them with a reasonable certainty that the economy will recover. This was not the case when, in 1929, the stock market crashed, banks began to fail, and people lost their sources of livelihood in record numbers. It was a time when not only the economy was

deeply depressed, but the national spirit was one of despair.

The greatness of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose centennial we celebrate today, was to lift the national spirit so that the Nation could confront and solve its mighty problems and form the resolve to win a terrible war. Roosevelt approached national problems with the same high courage and resolve with which he had approached a seemingly insurmountable personal affliction—polio. In each case, he persisted where many others would have despaired, and he was not limited by the narrow confines of conventional wisdom.

Instead, he tried new ideas and approaches, a New Deal. Some programs succeeded, many did not. But through this process he forged a lasting structure of programs which helped to insure that never again would the banks fail, the poor and elderly be left without resort, and the economy so abruptly grind to a halt. He established a new role for Government, one of actively participating in and sustaining the economy in troubled times. While some have assailed this role, it is undeniable that the transformation wrought by Roosevelt helped to save our economic system by restoring faith in it.

Roosevelt also saved our Nation and our allies from a threat which many would have preferred to ignore. Nazi Germany came perilously close to winning its European war before the United States entered the Second World War. Yet Roosevelt, who may well have preserved democracy in this country, most certainly saved it in Western Europe. By sustaining Britain in its lonely struggle and, after Pearl Harbor, providing the leadership needed to enter the war, Roosevelt turned the tide of a fight to preserve the lives and liberties of millions.

So while the past is sometimes easy to forget, let us not forget Franklin Roosevelt, a man who confronted hopelessness and won.●

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the best measure of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's greatness is in the tributes from people of such diverse political ideologies and beliefs.

Columnist Carl Rowan sums up his feelings this way: "The Roosevelt revolution generated and nurtured hope."

Even staunch conservative George Will speaks of F. D. R. in glowing terms:

Radiating an infectious zest, he did the most important thing a President can do: he gave the nation a hopeful, and hence creative, stance toward the future.

F. D. R. was an outstanding individual and a great leader. He left us a truly splendid legacy. He transcended overwhelming physical limitations through the sheer force of his will and his raw courage. He gave us many of the most basic values we have come to

take for granted—minimum wage protections, insured bank savings, the right to join labor unions, and the National Labor Relations Act. And he refused again and again to accept the possibility of anything except a triumph of the best principles, even in the worst circumstances.

But we should be wary of enshrining F. D. R. F. D. R. was a man of his time. He was a composite of strengths and weaknesses like we all are. In fact, it was these very human characteristics which made what he did even greater and endeared him to us all the more.

We all know that F. D. R. changed American life in such a fundamental way that whole political philosophies sprung up in reaction to his New Deal. He changed the very nature of the Presidency, making the Presidential office the head and heart of the Federal Government. His decisions affected the balance of world power and ultimately the course of American history. But most of all, he raised our country's morale and confidence at a time in this Nation's history when the outlook was the bleakest.

For this, we should all be grateful.

When I think of F. D. R., I think of the words of the Irish dramatist Brendan Behan:

My only politics is that kids should be able to play in the summertime, old people should be able to keep warm in the winter, and everybody ought to eat at least one good meal a day.

Nowhere is that better exemplified than in the social security system F. D. R. created. It represents the most basic social compact between the Federal Government and the American people and a bonding of the generations. It changed people's basic concept of what their work and their American citizenship meant. In F. D. R.'s own words:

It is the purpose of the government to see that not only the legitimate interests of the few are protected, but that the welfare and rights of the many are conserved.

Regrettably, our social security program is under heavy fire today. Slowly, despite our efforts in the House and the overwhelming public support, the American people are being deprived of their hard-earned social security benefits. This is something F. D. R. would not have tolerated, and neither should we.

F. D. R. left a mighty legacy, but not one to be enshrined or to remain static. Our challenge is to develop the dynamic spirit of caring that permeated all of his initiatives and policies. Even though today's circumstances are different, hopefully we do not have to relive history to discover that the purpose and necessity of the National Government is to respond to and be responsible to the American people.

Perhaps the ultimate tribute to the legacy of F. D. R. will come in our commitment to preserve the integrity of the social security system and the spirit of the many other programs his genius and foresight inspired.●

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on this 100th anniversary of his birth, every aspect of the life and administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt will be commented on; there is little to add to the mountains of commemorative tributes and critical discussions of a man who dominated American politics and society for over a decade. But I would ask what it was about F. D. R. which makes him seem so vital and important to us now, when many of his contemporaries who seemed at the time to be giants have been forgotten.

I think that F. D. R.'s central achievement was to make the fundamental commitment that government should protect the average citizen against the domination of enormous economic and social forces which interfered with normal daily life. Roosevelt did not want government dominating people or telling them what to do; he recognized, however, that government was responsible for some minimum standards of social decency in the face of threats too large for the individual to be able to control. It was not one program or another which made F. D. R. a giant, but his overall concern for the American people. Our Nation still owes him its gratitude.●

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 30, 1982, our Nation will be celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of a man who has become one of the few individuals in American history to rise above partisan politics in the minds of the people.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the 32d President of the United States, like Washington and Lincoln before him, has achieved a place in the hearts of Americans which places him above party, politics, or ideological debate. The lead article in the New Republic for January 27, 1982, cites President Reagan as "the man who, by quoting this greatest of Democrats in his acceptance speech to the 1980 Republican convention, confirmed the place of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the pantheon of nonpartisan American heroes."

The affection and awe in which Americans hold Franklin Delano Roosevelt does not alter the fact, however, that many of the programs which were instituted by his administration are still controversial. Nonetheless, none can deny that the Roosevelt administration had a profound influence on our way of life, and that 50 years after his first election, we still feel the ramifications of his administration.

Those of us from the mid-Hudson Valley of New York hold a special affection for our old neighbor, F. D. R., for he was born and raised on the

banks of the Hudson. It was to his home in Hyde Park that he sought solace during the years of public service, and it was there that he was finally laid to eternal rest in 1945.

One of the most memorable episodes of my young life occurred at the National Boy Scout Jamboree held in Arlington, Va., in the late 1930's. My troop was camped next to the troop from the neighboring community of Hyde Park, which had constructed a miniature replica of the Roosevelt Hyde Park home. The President made a point of coming over to view their handiwork and to personally greet all of us from the Hudson Valley. To this day, I am impressed with the charismatic personality of the man; one of the few persons in our history who can truly be called "bigger than life."

Part of the reason that our Nation remembers and honors Roosevelt was his unparalleled skill at the political game. Louis J. Lefkowitz, who was my boss when I served as an assistant attorney general of New York State back in the 1950's, was a young State assemblyman during Franklin Roosevelt's term as Governor, from 1929 until 1933. Mr. Lefkowitz was quoted in the New York Times earlier this week as describing Governor Roosevelt in this way: "He knew exactly what he wanted and was determined to get it."

That determination in Governor Roosevelt was soon made evident to all of us by President Roosevelt. At a time when millions of Americans were unemployed, when their life savings were extinguished in the hundreds of bank failures, when the entire financial structure of the Nation was threatened, he stated in his first inaugural address to the Nation:

This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country to-day. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days. . . .

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was unique among the giants of our history in that he did not lead us through one supreme crisis, as did Lincoln, but through two of the greatest crises our Nation has ever faced. No sooner had the economic depression begun to fade into history, than we were faced with the menace of Fascist militarism run rampant throughout the Far East and Europe.

Roosevelt shared with Lincoln the gift to grasp the significance which the events of his time held. Just as Lincoln almost alone among his con-

temporaries understood that a Southern victory in the War Between the States would signal the end of democratic government on a grand scale anywhere in the world, Roosevelt almost alone understood in the late 1930's that Hitler's racist expansionism—as well as Japan's military conquests—would in the end draw the United States into this titanic conflict. Roosevelt understood that the United States was, in the phrase of the time, the "arsenal of democracy." Roosevelt understood that the task of conquering the dark forces of Hitlerism and militarism would ultimately rest on the shoulders of Americans.

Like Lincoln, and like all of the great leaders of history, Roosevelt had the ability to concisely summarize the issues at hand in such a way that all could understand them. By summarizing the goals of the war in the famous Atlantic Charter with Prime Minister Churchill, by articulating the aims of the war in his "day of infamy" message to Congress, and by the fireside chats which continued throughout the war, Roosevelt again displayed his greatest talent: The talent to make us Americans believe that we are invincible. Without his leadership, the mammoth tasks of World War II would have been so much harder a burden to bear.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt died just weeks before the ultimate victory in that conflict, and weeks before his dream of a United Nations came to fruition. Last session, I had the honor of serving as a U.S. delegate to the U.N. General Assembly. There may well be no monument to this man that we can construct greater than the United Nations—the living and perpetual monument to the leadership, and hope, that Franklin Delano Roosevelt presented to all of the peoples on Earth.

This coming Saturday, ceremonies at Hyde Park, just across the Hudson River from my own 26th Congressional District of New York, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of this man, who now lies buried just a few feet from the site of his birth. Although President Roosevelt may have passed away physically, he will live on forever in the minds and hearts of the people as long as freedom, faith, and hope survive in the human existence.

Mr. Speaker, Franklin Delano Roosevelt will not be remembered just as a dynamic political leader, or even as a great New Yorker. He has achieved the ultimate accolade of being remembered as a great American. ●

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, few if any statesmen can compare to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is only appropriate that we remember F. D. R. on this the occasion of his 100th birthday. Throughout his public career, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a committed champion of the common

man. While he was Governor of the State of New York, Roosevelt assembled a program that provided tax relief to farmers and less expensive public utilities for consumers. He also pioneered the development of state supported old age pensions and unemployment insurance.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt ascended to the Presidency the economic situation of this country was desperate. Between 13 million and 15 million people were unemployed, most of the Nation's banks were closed, and industrial production was significantly depressed. In his inaugural address, Roosevelt immediately set about the task of restoring popular confidence. His own confidence was unmistakable:

This great nation will endure, will revive and will prosper . . . the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror.

F. D. R. received bipartisan support, and he sought to maintain that consensus. His Cabinet was geographically as well as politically balanced and included for the first time, a woman—Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal encompassed a relief program which was far reaching. He first obtained from Congress funds to alleviate human suffering. Congress established the Federal Emergency Relief Administration which granted funds to State relief agencies for direct relief. Millions of homeowners and farmers were aided by mortgage relief.

Perhaps the key components of the New Deal program were acts which stimulated business enterprise and regenerated farm prosperity. The National Industrial Recovery Act had two facets. On the one hand, it provided a substantial appropriation for public works and on the other it encouraged management and labor to establish codes that would provide for fair trade practices, minimum wages, maximum hours, and collective bargaining for organized labor. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration focused on raising farm prices. Roosevelt's New Deal program also saw the passage of the Works Progress Administration, the National Labor Relations Act, and most notably the Social Security Act which included both unemployment and old age insurance.

In 1932, F. D. R. said that the Presidency is preeminently a place of moral leadership. No President more completely espoused that concept. All Americans gained from the relief programs established by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The New Deal gave hope to the poor, minorities, the unemployed, and did much to again engender faith in government. Today, as we remember Franklin Delano Roosevelt on his 100th birthday, let us all pledge to work toward his principle goal—the

improvement of the quality of life for all Americans.●

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

A recent magazine article perhaps summed up F. D. R.'s contribution to our democracy, and his place in American history, best. They called him "the 20th century's addition to the roster of Founding Fathers." It is a very short roster, and F. D. R. surely belongs. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and F. D. R. Each in his own way, these are the men who formed, and sustained, and reformed our Government.

For those of us who have never known any America but post-F. D. R. America, it is difficult to understand how much of what we take for granted we owe to F. D. R. It is not too much to say that he redefined government, and gave it a whole new identity.

To put it in the terms of recent political debate, the America F. D. R. left behind was indeed much better off than the America he inherited. He came to power at the blackest moment in a very black time; the nadir of the Great Depression. Americans had lost faith in business, in government, in themselves. In his first inaugural, F. D. R. told the country it had nothing to fear but fear itself, and people believed him.

The New Deal was marked by a really new approach to government, powered by the idea that the Government, the Federal Government, had a direct interest in and responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. So many New Deal programs, social security, unemployment insurance, and the labor law reforms, now seem so natural it is hard to imagine an America without them. Yet America before Roosevelt was without them, and was much worse off for it.

In foreign affairs, F. D. R. found America a second-rate power, of little account in the world, and left it the most powerful nation in history, triumphant in history's greatest war.

The strength that America brought to bear on the war, in terms of the aid we gave our allies through lend-lease and other programs before we entered the war as well as the spirit and bravery of our fighting men, was the result of F. D. R.'s foresight in recognizing the threat of fascism.

For 13 years F. D. R. led the Nation, through its most desperate time economically, and through its most perilous time militarily since the birth of the republic. He restored hope and faith and optimism to a people burdened with despair, and when he died, millions of Americans for whom he was the embodiment of hope and faith and optimism wept. Their good fortune, and ours, was that his legacy

provided the basis for a strong, prosperous, and free America.

In these times of economic distress and political uncertainty, we should all consider the Roosevelt legacy as we chart our Nation's future course.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be able to commemorate January 28 as the 100th anniversary birthday of our great 32d President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The achievements of this man are innumerable, serving as President for more than 12 years and being the only President elected for an unprecedented four times.

He was a man who displayed personal courage, giving the people of the United States the strength to fight against the economic deprivation that plagued this country during the 1930's, as well as the courage to fight during the Second World War.

Among his notable accomplishments and offices held, he served as New York State senator, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Governor of New York State before becoming President in 1932.

Although crippled by polio, President Roosevelt retained his youthfulness and vitality, setting an example for the American people during the hard years of the Depression. The American people regarded him as a friend and a protector and thus he was able to unify the American work force.

He established numerous Government agencies such as the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps), the TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority), and the NRA (National Recovery Administration), along with numerous Federal emergency relief programs, all of which helped America out of the Great Depression. He instilled confidence during the banking crisis and through his tax relief programs he relieved some of the burdens carried by the American farmers. Overall, his New Deal program enlisted the powers of our Federal Government as a means of restoring the economic prosperity of the 1920's.

President Roosevelt was a reformer and an innovator. He laid the groundwork for much of what exists in our Government today. He was able to mobilize the American people during periods of crisis as well as successfully lead the American people through the worst war that we ever experienced.

This man will continue to serve as a model commanding respect from generations to come. No one will ever forget his fireside chats, his achievements, and the warm personal relationship that he established with the people of the United States and the world.●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand here today to join in paying tribute to a giant figure in our Nation's history, President Franklin

Delano Roosevelt, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth date.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt stood for the one quality, above all, that characterizes our country: compassion. Compassion for the less fortunate in our society to whom we have a moral obligation to support. Compassion for those who are struggling to improve themselves to insure a more prosperous future for themselves and their children by giving them a hand. And, finally, compassion for our neighbors and those around us to whom we can offer help and from whom we can derive support and strength.

In many ways, it is this compassion that is the basis of our strength. For compassion is not a sign of weakness but of a commitment to improve ourselves and the lot of our fellow man. If ever there was a person in the right place at the right time, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was such a person. He combined enormous optimism, enthusiasm, and vigor, with a commitment to take command of the situation and charge full speed ahead with the work needed to get the job done.

He came into office at a time when the Nation was mired in despair and a paralysis of the spirit was evident. His electrifying first 100 days in office were the spark that put this country on the road to economic recovery and reform.

My first recollection that there is a person known as the President of the United States was when Franklin D. Roosevelt was President. I remember when I was 6 years old listening to the radio when he declared war on Japan; particularly I remember the strength and the conviction in his voice that, somehow, in the middle of all the despair and uncertainty around us, conveyed a belief that we would come out victorious. As Joseph Alsop so accurately states in a recent article in the Smithsonian magazine:

Hope was in fact Franklin Roosevelt's greatest gift to his fellow American. Partly, he gave us hope by his deeds, when he came to office in a time that seemed utterly devoid of hope. But even more, he gave us hope because all could see that he himself felt not the slightest doubt about the future at any time in his years as President.

We are all aware of the extent of the impact of the laws enacted during the Roosevelt years. All Americans have been assured protection of their basic human needs under the philosophy which is the cornerstone of the new deal offered by Roosevelt.

As President Roosevelt stated during a message to Congress in 1941:

We look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want—everywhere in the

world. The fourth is freedom from fear—anywhere in the world.

President Roosevelt recognized that, in an ever interrelated world, the old system of reliance solely on individual action and responsibility was no longer feasible. The rugged individualism that built our country is a great heritage and was essential to our development. But with our growth—both economically and in numbers—and with the astounding developments in the communications and natural sciences areas, our dependence on one another grew. It thus became important for the Federal Government to take the lead in insuring that our interrelation with one another is not translated into a dependence that is detrimental to individual dignity and human development, or that can be abused by those that have power over our daily lives. This interrelation is not limited within our country but also with other nations on Earth. As President Roosevelt states during his fourth inaugural address:

We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations, far away. . . . We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.

It was this vision of the world which fueled our efforts not only toward economic recovery and reform but also during World War II.

President Roosevelt is admired and fondly remembered in Puerto Rico also because of his appointment of Rexford G. Tugwell as Governor. Governor Tugwell was a trusted member of Roosevelt's "brain trust" as an adviser particularly concerned about the plight of the small farmer and later on as head of the resettlement administration in the Department of Agriculture. His tenure in Puerto Rico—the last mainland-born appointed Governor—was characterized by laying the foundation for the economic development of Puerto Rico that turned around the island from the poorhouse of the Caribbean into a vibrant, progressive society.

I remember hearing on the radio of President Roosevelt's death when I was 10 years old and feeling as though a member of my own family had died. But the values and hopes for which he fought and which he represented carry on as his legacy to us. It is important that we continue to fight for them and to defend them even as we adapt them to the needs of our ever-changing Nation. The debt of gratitude owed by our country to President Roosevelt is being recognized and I, for one, pledge my continued support to the principles for which Franklin D. Roosevelt stood. ●

● Mr. MATTOX. Mr. Speaker, this month we mark the 100th anniversary of one of our greatest Presidents—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This man who overcame the crippling effects of polio went on to lead our Nation through its gravest domestic crisis and most severe international challenge in this century.

In each case, he weathered the test.

In meeting these challenges, he left as his legacy programs that define our present-day social and economic system and a style of leadership that is the test against which we measure the performance of our Presidents today.

As we face a time of economic trial today, it is helpful to look back to see how F. D. R. met the grave economic challenge of his time and to see what lessons we can draw for ourselves today.

The programs enacted during the Roosevelt administration are now so much a part of the fabric of our society that we tend to take the benefits of these programs for granted. We assume they have always been there.

One way to appreciate the Roosevelt legacy is to remember what it was like before F. D. R.'s New Deal.

Before F. D. R., no Federal program provided the elderly with any degree of security in their retirement years. After F. D. R., there was social security.

Before F. D. R., no one's savings deposits were secure. After F. D. R., the Federal Government insured savings accounts.

Before F. D. R., adequate regulation of the securities market did not exist. After F. D. R., the stock market was regulated to protect investors and the larger economy.

Before F. D. R., workers could be fired for union activity. After F. D. R., the worker's right to organize into free trade unions was secured.

As Joe Alsop reminds us in his recent book on F. D. R., the Roosevelt legacy may be summed up by saying he included the excluded.

Until Roosevelt, many of the economic and political benefits of this land were denied to those who were not rich, not white, and not of an Anglo-Saxon Protestant background. F. D. R. began the process, still incomplete, of including the previously excluded groups of Americans into our society, economy, and politics.

Roosevelt's greatness lies not only in the programs he left us, but also in the way he exercised leadership. For many of us today, the way that F. D. R. exercised leadership still provides the model against which we evaluate contemporary Presidents.

What were some of the keys to F. D. R.'s effective leadership?

One key to his leadership was that he was a master communicator. F. D. R. was effective in all settings—large audiences as well as small groups. He was particularly effective in the use of radio, which was the

most important means of communication in his time.

F. D. R. also had a gift of explaining some very complex ideas and proposals in a way that was understandable to everyone.

Another important element in his leadership was his emphasis on experimentation. F. D. R. was not a prisoner of any ideology. He wanted results. In order to achieve results, he was open to ideas from just about any source. If something did not work, he would reject it and try something else.

F. D. R. was also very effective in conveying a sense of optimism about the future. But it is not enough just to convey optimism. Such optimism has to be credible.

Many Presidents who try to convey optimism are unconvincing. Roosevelt's optimism, however, was believable. People believed that things would actually get better. They felt this way because they saw he actually had a program that was workable and was fair to everyone.

What useful lessons for today can we draw from the Roosevelt years?

First, we must not stray from the inclusionary principle laid down by F. D. R. It is the right path. It is the fairest. It has brought unequalled benefits to the people of our Nation.

But in following the path of F. D. R., we must also remember his emphasis on experimentation and results. We should continue his work but do it as he would have done it—with an openness to new ideas and an emphasis on what works.

Just like Roosevelt, we should not be blindly attached to policies of the past that have become outmoded. Our test should be what works. Conditions change. Problems are solved. We should be willing to reassess policies in the light of changing conditions. And if we decide that a policy is no longer appropriate, it is not an admission that the policy was always wrong. It is only an admission that it is not appropriate or useful under today's conditions.

To continue the work begun by F. D. R. of including the previously excluded and to do so in the manner of F. D. R.—with an openness to new ideas and a willingness to discard policies that don't work—this is how we can best honor the memory of F. D. R. ●

● Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commemorating the 100th anniversary of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birth. I can think of no better way to start the 2d session of this historical 97th Congress than to pay tribute to a man whose leadership and creativity helped restore a nation's confidence. President Roosevelt was a symbol of a time when Americans were able to triumph over great adversity. Americans were

faced with the Great Depression, which left many families economically devastated, but Roosevelt was able to give the American people a new faith, hope, and dignity. We honor this great American President because he had the creative courage to reshape the role of government in order to tackle the economic problems facing the nation. President Roosevelt simply believed that the Government was responsible for the poor and jobless in society. With this sound wisdom, he expanded the role of the Federal Government by creating the New Deal, which provided the American people with such measures as unemployment insurance, old-age provisions, slum clearance, and low-income housing projects. In a time of economic crisis, President Roosevelt did not turn his back on the American people, but instead, he created an economic program that embraced the needs of the American people. What he gave to our Nation was far more than a New Deal, he created a government that had a deep sense of duty and responsibility in looking after the poor and jobless in our society.

As we pay tribute to this great leader of social justice, I find it appropriate that we now begin to rethink the priorities of this historical 97th Congress. It is time to implement an economic program that reflects the needs of our society. It is time to listen to the frustrations of our unemployed, and the suffering of our poor in order to find the same courage that Franklin Delano Roosevelt found, and create an economic program that is not tailored for the privileged, but one that fits the needs of all Americans. ●

● Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. To honor him, one of my constituents, Barbara Ames, has written a poem called *How Goes the Peace*.

I would like to share this poem with my colleagues on this very special day.

HOW GOES THE PEACE

IN HONOR OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(By Barbara Ames)

There was a time not too long in our past
When free men of the world, immobilized
Watched an heroic band in mortal fray
With madness bent on torturing mankind,
The ravaging force sought total mastery of
all the world

We watched the battle, weeks passed into
months,

Defending forces dwindled dangerously
And still we watched and waited, hypnotized,

Our fate and mankind's future on the scale,
Or slavery, to destroy us one by one,
Or liberty, hard earned through centuries.

Who can forget that knew the tyrant's
might?

The drone of flying squadrons filled the
sky,

The screaming rockets with their silent
strike;

But still the brave fought on for liberty,
And still we watched with calculated calm,
And those of us who cared were agonized,
When would we lend our force to Britain's
few

Or would we watch them totally destroyed.
The tension grew volcanic, free men prayed,
When from the East a rising sun burst forth
With fury on our reveling innocents.

A judgment come to ruin recovery's hope.
We were attacked and forced to make a
stand.

Aligned at last with allies, friends once
more.

The world was shaken by a grim ferocity
As free men everywhere saw truth at last.
The battle nearly won a wary friend
Joined to destroy our Western foe.

Two atom bombs and Eastern peace was
won.

Half dazed, in shock and ill, our leaders met,
To forge a lasting peace for all mankind.
What did we win, and do we recognize
Tyranny as an ever threatening force?

Is noble sacrifice so soon forgot, the battle
won.

Our children grow untaught the history.
That war was won indeed, how goes the
peace? ●

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on this January 30, as we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of our Nation's 32d President, we pay tribute to an American whose courage and tenacity have been an inspiration to all. Obstacles and defeat were virtually unknown to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the man who led our Nation during one of the most difficult periods in American history.

Despite a handicap which left F. D. R. physically impaired, he rose to greatness in the eyes of his fellow Americans. Tackling the obstacles which confronted him, Mr. Roosevelt approached the Presidency fearlessly, working toward the American dream. F. D. R.'s New Deal offered new hope and a means for revitalizing the economy. Through his programs, F. D. R. once again started the Nation on the road to economic recovery.

Americans will long remember the fireside chats and the politics, but at this anniversary commemoration, let us not forget the man. Let us pay tribute to a man who has inspired Americans by his conquering spirit, his courage and commitment, his ability to rise again in times of defeat, and his dreams for a great society.

Today we need to recall the invincible spirit of F. D. R. In tackling the problems of the 1930's and 1940's, he demonstrated to all that "the only thing we have to fear, is fear itself." Fifty years later this is still good advice. ●

SOCIAL SECURITY STUDENT BENEFITS

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much concern expressed in the last few weeks over the impending phaseout of the social security student benefit. Many efforts are being made to squeeze into college as many high school seniors as possible before the May 1982 cutoff for new people entering the student benefit program.

The cutoff of student benefits was a budget reduction which passed this Congress last year with considerable support. The Ways and Means Committee proposed to postpone this action for 2 years so that high school seniors could have some notice, but that approach was rejected both by the Senate and by Gramm-Latta, and the May 1982 cutoff was set in law with the intention of excluding this year's high school seniors from the program.

I am concerned that these students are finding out about the change very late in the game, even though the Social Security Administration has made some effort to publicize it. I call on the SSA to do more to get the word out to students and their families so that they might know what to expect—and I would include in this not just the seniors but students already in college, who will suffer 25 percent annual cutbacks, and younger students who planned on this aid in the future. They need all possible advance notice.

To make matters more difficult, this benefit is being phased out at the same time alternative student aids are being cut severely. We must not endanger the education of our youth. We should hold up on further cutbacks until we see just what effect the current reductions will have.

WE SHOULD LEARN FROM HISTORY

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, they say everyone carries around with him his own yardstick for measuring greatness.

That must be true, for in the midst of the present atmosphere of economic disaster, I find myself wishing every day we had a man in the White House like Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I do not suggest that the crisis of 1982 has yet reached the seriousness of that which faced Roosevelt when he was inaugurated President in 1933. But we will be foolish indeed if we underestimate the potential of the present administration's economic policies to buy us a calamity rivaling that of the early 1930's.

It is fitting that the Congress and the country pause this week to mark the centennial of Franklin Roosevelt's

birth, and to remember with appropriate ceremonies throughout this year the greatness of the man and the legacy he left us.

President Roosevelt had already passed from the scene when I came to the House in 1949, nearly 4 years after his death. But I was old enough to have an awareness of his Presidency since I was serving as a county official during the early 1940's. And from the day of his inauguration I was aware of the impact of Roosevelt on people who suffered cruelly from the economic disaster which had befallen the Nation.

I was privileged to serve in this Chamber with two of his sons, James and Franklin, Jr. Congressman James Roosevelt was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor during my earlier years here. And both of them were good friends.

From the onset of the Great Depression in late 1929 until President Roosevelt's inaugural in March 1933, more than 4,000 banks in this country had failed, and the pace was accelerating.

In the month before the 1932 Presidential election, Nevada had been obliged to proclaim a bank holiday to preserve the financial institutions in that State. In February 1933, Louisiana suspended all banking activities, and 10 days later Michigan did the same. In March, many other States were in a similar situation. At last, on the morning of inauguration day, New York's Governor, Herbert H. Lehman, reluctantly followed suit, leaving the richest State in the Nation substantially without banking services.

In the final 2 weeks of President Hoover's term, depositors demonstrated their lack of confidence in their financial institutions by withdrawing more than \$1 billion, and hoarding the cash.

President Roosevelt's first major act upon assuming office was to declare a 4-day bank holiday, commencing March 7, 1933—the Monday following his Saturday inaugural. Every bank in the United States was closed until the panic could be arrested and the sound ones sorted out from the weak.

Encouraged by the President's expressions of confidence in the future and by his energy in setting the wheels of Government whirling, the crisis in America's banking system was overcome.

It was clear that a major operation was necessary to save the banking

system of the country and to restore the confidence of the people. That was the operation Franklin Roosevelt mounted and was able to pull the country back from financial collapse.

The late Walter Lippmann described those perilous days this way:

At the end of February we were a congeries of disorderly, panic-stricken mobs and factions. In the 100 days from March to June, we became again an organized nation confident of our power to provide for our own security and to control our own destiny.

The character and the courage of Franklin D. Roosevelt were responsible for that victory over panic 49 years ago this winter. And there is a lesson in his Presidency that we should re-study in this winter of 1982.

Today, the jobless toll stands at 9.5 million, and climbing upward to 10 million—a ghastly goal we may reach when the next monthly accounting takes place.

Today, our housing industry is a basket case because of the tight money policies espoused by the President and the Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Today, our automotive industry has become a cropper with sales plummeting and worker layoffs rising.

Today, business failures are reported on a steep upward climb as, one by one, businessmen fall before the financial juggernaut of high interest rates.

Today, farmers throughout the country are in trouble.

These are but a few of the warning flags that are flying from our economic battlements. They ought to tell us something.

They do. They tell us we need a man in the White House who will take command of the perilous situation and shake some economic sense into our monetary policies.

Franklin Roosevelt knew—and often said—that the banking industry stands in a special relationship to the people of a democratic society in that it is permitted only to operate for the service of the people. Banks were never intended to be our masters.

Banks lay prostrate and defeated 49 years ago, and President Roosevelt revived them on behalf of the people. They recovered their health and their arrogance. And within a few years began acting again like "economic royalists," as Roosevelt effectively described them.

It is now time for another President to remind them that they exist for

us—and not the other way around. It is time for the President to take decisive action to bring interest rates down to sensible levels.

We should learn from history that if the rates are permitted to continue at current levels for much longer, they endanger the whole economic system.

Those of us who remember Franklin Roosevelt know what he would do when faced with a crisis in the economy such as plagues us now.

President Roosevelt's present day successor could profit by careful reading of 1933 history and so could this Congress.

DANIELSON REPORT

(Mr. DANIELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, responses to my most recent questionnaire sent to all of my constituents at yearend have now been tallied and I want to share those results with my colleagues.

You will note that President receives a considerably higher rating for a job well done from my constituents than the Congress receives. Opposition to wage and price controls is slightly higher than support. A similar small plurality of those opposed to 4-year terms for Members of the House outnumber supporters.

Sunday voting, however, met with approval by a 48- to 42-percent margin, and the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit gained an almost 3 to 1 edge of support. A law declaring that human life begins at conception was opposed by nearly 58 percent, with 35 percent favoring such a law.

It was interesting to note that the U.S. Postal Service, although receiving a favorable rating from less than half of the constituents who responded, ranked considerably higher in popularity than the other Federal agencies listed. I was proud to note, however, that my congressional office led all of the agencies, receiving a vote of support from nearly 63 percent of those responding, as opposed to less than 7 percent giving it an unfavorable rating.

The full text of the questionnaire, with results, is as follows:

DANIELSON REPORT—1982 QUESTIONNAIRE—YOUR VIEWS WILL HELP ME SERVE YOU BETTER

(In percent)

	Favor or approve	Oppose or disapprove	No opinion
1. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Reagan is handling his job as President?	56.8	36.6	6.6
2. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Congress is handling its job?	25.5	59.9	14.6
3. Would you favor or oppose having the government bring back wage and price controls?	44.4	47.5	8.1
4. How would you feel about changing the term of Members of the House Representatives from 2 years to 4 years? Would you favor or oppose this?	42.2	50.2	7.6
5. Do you favor or oppose keeping the present 55-mile-per-hour speed limit on the highways of the Nation?	72.8	24.1	3.1
6. It has been proposed that the United States supply China with military weapons if Russian troops move into Poland. Would you favor or oppose such action?	34.8	52.0	13.2

DANIELSON REPORT—1982 QUESTIONNAIRE—YOUR VIEWS WILL HELP ME SERVE YOU BETTER—Continued

[In percent]

	Favor or approve	Oppose or disapprove	No opinion
7. The U.S. Congress is considering a law which would declare human life begins at conception, and therefore abortion at any time could be considered a crime of murder. Would you favor or oppose such law?	35.1	57.8	7.1
8. Would you favor or oppose requiring all young men to give 1 year of service to the Nation—either in the military forces or in nonmilitary work here or abroad, such as work in hospitals or with elderly people?	78.6	17.5	3.9
9. Would you favor or oppose such a program for women?	60.4	33.5	6.1
10. In recent national elections, only about half those eligible to vote have actually gone to the polls. One proposal for increasing voter turnout is to make it more convenient to vote by holding national elections on Sunday, a nonworking day, instead of on Tuesday, as at present. Would you favor or oppose having election day on Sunday?	48.2	41.8	10.0
11. How likely do you think we are to get into a nuclear war within the next 10 years? Very likely 16.4 percent. Fairly likely 19.5 percent. Fairly unlikely 23.4 percent. Very unlikely 23.4 percent. Not sure 17.3 percent.			
12. Russia is said to be spending many times as much protecting its people from nuclear attack as the United States is spending. Do you think we should do more than we are now doing, do less, or do you think our present efforts are about right? Do more 51.6 percent. Do less 6.5 percent. Present efforts about right 26.6 percent. Not sure 15.3 percent.			
	Favorable	Unfavorable	Not sure
13. To help me in my continuing efforts to make the Federal Government more responsive and courteous to its citizens, please rate the following government agencies in accordance with your personal experience.			
U.S. Postal Service	43.9	50.8	5.3
Immigration and Naturalization Service	16.4	59.2	24.4
Veterans' Administration	29.9	37.0	33.1
Social Security Administration	36.7	47.0	16.3
Internal Revenue Service	37.8	46.4	15.8
My congressional office	62.7	6.7	30.6

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be in attendance at the ceremony held earlier today in this Chamber honoring the commemoration of the 100th year of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

That occasion was the creation of a bipartisan effort to recognize the enormous contributions of this extraordinary man in a time of this Nation's most trying economic test.

Although I have never been a strong ideological ally of that President, and occasionally take issue with his political beliefs and his party affiliation, I was thoroughly impressed with the proceedings this morning. My colleagues were eloquent, and the music was magnificent. I enjoyed the ceremony immensely and I found it a truly moving and inspiring occasion in the finest traditions of America in honoring the dignity of free men and women in the political process of a democratic society.

Occasionally, Mr. Speaker, our political system, which receives so much criticism and scorn, rises to the occasion, and this was truly one of those times. My heart is filled with pride to be a citizen of this Republic and a Member of this body.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was extremely pleased to hear the news reports concerning

the release of General Dozier. I am happy for the general and for his family. I believe that the United States also owes a debt of gratitude to the Italian authorities for their successful action in location and freeing General Dozier. Their continual and exhaustive activity in this regard is reflective of the high degree of professionalism in the Italian police and intelligence services.

In view of the release of General Dozier from Italian terrorists, I believe it is timely to commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the December 29, 1981, edition of the Wall Street Journal. The editorial, written by noted terrorism expert Claire Sterling, is entitled "General Dozier and the International Terror Network." I believe it helps dispel the notion that these terrorist operations are merely domestic expressions of extremism. Rather, using the terrorists' own words, the editorial shows that terrorist groups, acting in concert, are clearly engaged in an anti-United States, anti-NATO plan to undermine the West and benefit the Soviet Union.

While the editorial limits itself to just a few recent incidents, the broader picture must not be lost on the reader. The issue is not whether the Soviet Union approves in advance each and every terrorist incident in Western Europe. This is unnecessary. By providing training bases, both in the Soviet Union and the Third World, providing weapons, and providing money and documentation, the Soviet Union and their proxies are guilty of these heinous acts just as surely as if they had pulled the trigger themselves.

I am always saddened when I hear someone say that we must try to understand and accommodate the Soviet Union if we are to avoid a new cold

war. I fear that such people are perceiving the Soviet Union through rose colored glasses. I must ask, when did the cold war end? Before or after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia? Before or after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan? Before or after the use of Soviet supplied chemical-biological weapons in Southeast Asia? How does the end of the cold war theory fit in with the current Soviet directed crack-down in Poland today?

No, I am afraid that as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the cold war has never ended. It has merely been continued under one guise or another. Today, they find that international terrorism is a promising vehicle, especially against open societies predicated upon individual liberty. Not only can they disavow direct involvement with a particular terrorist incident, but they reap the long term benefits from destabilization in the West. A terrorist act not only causes danger for those who are targets of the attack, but it undermines our basic liberty and freedom as strong counteraction is demanded to bring a halt to these acts.

For those of us in the West, the long term key to the situation will be how we effectively respond to international terrorism, while at the same time safeguarding those values and principles that serve as the foundation of our free society. As for the Soviet Union, we must keep their feet to the fire on this issue. They cannot be permitted to maintain the fiction that they are not involved in the problem. As much as being a war of violence, this is a war of propaganda. The West must come to grips with the problem. A stable society is at stake. We cannot let the Soviets off the hook.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 29, 1981]

GENERAL DOZIER AND THE INTERNATIONAL TERROR NETWORK
(By Claire Sterling)

ROME.—Some days after kidnapping Brig. Gen. James Lee Dozier—the first American they have laid a finger on in all these years—Italy's Red Brigades issued a lengthy communique explaining why. Four lines were devoted to their captive, a "Yankee pig" of high NATO rank in "the American occupation army." The remaining 11 pages offered an unusually revealing glimpse of the Red Brigades' true nature and intentions.

We now have it from the horse's mouth that there really is such a thing as an international terror network; that the most elite of its bands in Western Europe are mobilizing to "disarticulate . . . the pulsing heart of imperialist counter-revolution NATO"; that the U.S. is their supreme target and Soviet Russia the privileged recipient of their favors.

The communique speaks of this network as an "organization of Communist combat," whose main battalions encircling "NATO's heartland in Western Europe" are mentioned by name: the Red Brigades in Italy, the Red Army Faction (Baader-Meinhof Gang) in West Germany, the Provisional IRA in Northern Ireland, the Basque ETA in Spain. The last two, once restricted by "the suffocating optic of nationalism," are at last moving on "to a larger sphere of war" against the West.

"The revolution will be internationalist or there will be no revolution!" the document declares.

Its authors make no effort to disguise their immediate strategic objectives. They state bluntly that the U.S. is trying to thrust cruise and Pershing missiles upon its subalterns in NATO, and build a neutron bomb, so as to bargain with the Soviet Union "from a position of strength." That effort must be blocked at all costs, everywhere in Western Europe and especially in West Germany, "whose geographical position makes it an ideal base for a land attack on Soviet Russia." There lies the giveaway phrase.

Directly after this comes a telltale reference to Italy, "key link in the NATO chain from Spain to Turkey," and thus next in importance as "an area of intensified conflict."

Between them, therefore, Italy and West Germany are singled out for special terrorist attention as "front-line states," and understandably so: They happen to be the only two NATO states on the Continent committed firmly to the installation of cruise and Pershing missiles.

"War on imperialist war! War on NATO! War on the strategic centers of the American military machine!" the communique concludes, lest anyone might still miss the point.

Not a word in this text refers to Soviet Russia's SS-20 missiles, pointing westward with their triple nuclear warheads. There is no reference to Soviet occupation armies either, whether in far-off Afghanistan or next-door Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany and Poland—particularly Poland. Martial law was imposed in Poland and the brutal suppression of Polish workers began, just four days before Gen. Dozier was kidnapped in Verona. You would never know it from reading the Red Brigades' Communique Number One on People's Prisoner James Lee Dozier.

The ugly implications in such timing could scarcely escape notice here. Italy's popular cartoonist, Forattini, promptly drew a wily Leonid Brezhnev leering at his audience over the caption: "Keep your nose out of Poland, and I'll give you back Dozier." But that is surely too simple a view of the case.

What the timing does suggest is an elaborate, carefully studied, long planned campaign to divide, discredit, demoralize and ultimately disarm NATO, designed to coincide with the opening of superpower disarmament talks in Geneva—cited explicitly in the Red Brigades' communique—and a wave of pacifist, anti-nuclear and markedly anti-American sentiment in Europe.

This is certainly not to suggest that everybody who is against nuclear weapons in Europe is a terrorist. It is, rather, to suggest that the international terror network has set out deliberately to hook onto, and make full use of, everybody who is against nuclear weapons in Europe.

Its efforts to turn their eyes in one direction only are not so mysterious any more. The Red Brigades have told us more in that regard than we might reasonably have expected.

Their kidnapping of Gen. Dozier, deputy commander of NATO's land forces in southern Europe, was an early salvo in the network's new tactics for warfare, but not the first. Three months before he was kidnapped by terrorists in Italy, their counterparts in Germany had fired a Soviet-made RPG-7 rocket at the armored car of General Kreuzer, who commands all U.S. forces in Europe. Their missile missed him by inches. It was launched only a few weeks after 11 closely spaced bomb attacks on American military installations in Germany: The Baader-Meinhof Gang's first display of serious violence since 1977.

Everything points, then, to the likelihood of renewed, protracted and bitter terrorist warfare in Europe, where a sanguine American public had assumed that the Red Brigades and Baader-Meinhof Gang (if not, perhaps, the IRA Provos and Basques in ETA) were as good as dead. Why would they die, when they can evidently count on bountiful, ongoing sustenance?

This does not augur well for Gen. Dozier. Anybody familiar with the Red Brigades' tactics would have seen through the cruel hoax of his announced execution just before Christmas. The Red Brigades would scarcely kill him off before milking the last drop of propaganda value out of his captivity, and that part of their program has just begun. Punctually, within days of his abduction, the slogan "Yenki Buoi" was added to Rome's rich collection of graffiti. That means "Yankee hangman," though the odd way Yankee is spelled suggests a non-Italian author. We have been there before, in the worst days of the "Yankee-Go-Home" Cold War. For reasons more sinister than mere historical accident, we may be getting there again.

FARMERS HIT BY ECONOMY

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at 10 a.m. the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee will meet in emergency session to consider the

necessity for allowing the Commodity Credit Corporation to borrow an additional \$5 billion to keep programs vital to American farmers and American agriculture from grinding to a halt.

This action has become necessary because:

Farmgate prices for agricultural crops are in a state of depression and more and more farmers are being forced to put their crops under the CCC loan program;

Farmgate price depression is so serious that it is necessary for our farmers to receive deficiency payments for their crops, including wheat, cotton, and rice;

The general recession in the American economy is reducing demand in this Nation and the spreading recession in our international markets along with the increasing value of the dollar overseas is reducing our foreign markets for U.S. farm products; and

High interest rates are eating up the funds available to the CCC for operating its programs.

Should the Congress not act swiftly to approve this additional borrowing authority for the CCC, the Corporation will have to suspend program operations by mid-February by stopping accepting crops for loans and will have to disrupt the issuance of deficiency payments including those for rice and cotton which are due in February.

The grim specter of a deteriorating American economy is raising its ugly head so that all Americans can see the stark reality of the consequences of the Reagan administration's economic policies.

While the administration did not produce the record worldwide harvests in 1981, the Reagan administration's high interest rate policies have managed to produce a stronger dollar overseas. The expensive American dollar in Western Europe, the Middle East, Latin America and the Orient cuts into the ability of foreign customers in those regions to buy American farm products.

The action we are taking tomorrow is noteworthy to the Nation because it is the first emergency economic action by the Congress in response to the Reagan administration's miscalculations and lack of planning to avoid the devastating effects its economic policies are having on all our people.

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF STATE TO PROVIDE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING EXTRADITION PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ZIAD ABU EAIN

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of the House, I move that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further

consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 300) directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain information concerning the pending extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the material offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I call up for immediate consideration the resolution (H. Res. 300) directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain information concerning the pending extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 300

Resolved, That not later than seven days after the adoption of this resolution, the Secretary of State shall furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information on the following:

(1) All documents in the possession of the Secretary relating to the Secretary's review of the proposed extradition of Ziad Abu Eain, including documents containing findings or recommendations with respect to the information and with respect to the issues that the Secretary should consider in determining whether to grant extradition or to exercise his discretion and deny extradition.

(2) All documents in the possession of the Secretary that were prepared by the Department of State and that relate to the extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain conducted by the United States magistrate, and all records in the possession of the Secretary of direct and indirect involvement of the Department of State in those proceedings.

(3) All documents in the possession of the Secretary concerning or containing recommendations with respect to whether the magistrate of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois should reopen the extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain in order to permit counsel for both parties to offer further evidence.

(4) Any document in the possession of the Secretary that identifies and explains or interprets the specific language in the Convention on Extradition between the United States and Israel that applies to and requires the extradition from the United States to Israel of persons who are not citizens of Israel or the United States, but are citizens of a third country.

(5) All documents in the possession of the Secretary containing findings or information relating to (A) human rights violations against persons extradited to Israel, (B) the treatment in Israel of Palestinians charged with terrorist or political offenses, or (C) the rights and protections accorded in Israel and the occupied territories to Palestinians and to Israeli citizens who are charged with criminal offenses.

(6) All documents in the possession of the Secretary describing adverse foreign policy repercussions if Ziad Abu Eain is extradited. All documents in the possession of the Secretary describing adverse foreign policy repercussions if Ziad Abu Eain is not extradited.

Mr. ZABLOCKI (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIELSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD), the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain the action taken by the House Foreign Affairs Committee with regard to House Resolution 300, a privileged resolution of inquiry directing the Department of State to furnish the House certain information relating to the extradition of Ziad Abu Eain.

This resolution of inquiry was introduced on December 10, 1981, by the Honorable GEORGE CROCKETT and the Honorable JOHN CONYERS, and referred jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and on the Judiciary. On December 11, 1981, I wrote the Secretary of State requesting his comments on the resolution of inquiry.

On December 12, 1981, Ziad Abu Eain was surrendered to the authorities of the Government of Israel pursuant to a surrender warrant executed by Deputy Secretary of State Clark.

Subsequently, on January 18, 1982, the Department of State responded in the form of a letter from the Honorable Richard Fairbanks, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, and an attached Memorandum of Decision on the extradition of Ziad Abu Eain. Also made available to the committee by the executive branch were other documents requested in the resolution. At the end of my statement I will insert in the RECORD the text of the letter and the Memorandum of Decision, as well as a summary of the other documents submitted to the committee.

On January 26, 1982, the Committee on Foreign Affairs met in open session to consider House Resolution 300. During the course of the meeting the committee heard testimony from the cosponsors of the resolution, Mr. CROCKETT and Mr. CONYERS and from Mr. Morris Draper, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and South Asia; Mr. Daniel W. McGovern, Deputy Legal Adviser, Department of State; and Mr. Roger Olson, Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Following the testimony and questioning of the witnesses, the commit-

tee agreed, with the concurrence of the cosponsors, that the Chair should seek to discharge the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees from further consideration of the resolution and to table said resolution in the House. It was further understood that the tabling of House Resolution 300 would not prejudice any further actions on the part of the cosponsors relating to the subject matter addressed in the resolution.

SUMMARY OF MATERIAL REQUESTED BY THE RESOLUTION

1. Paragraph 1 requests full and complete information regarding the issues considered by the Secretary in determining whether to grant or deny extradition in this case. The Department of State has provided the Committee with a memorandum of decision, which is responsive to the request in paragraph 1.

2. Paragraph 2 asks for information regarding the Department of State's role in the extradition hearing conducted by the federal magistrate. The Department of State is providing the Committee with a letter from State Department Assistant Legal Adviser K. E. Malmberg to Thomas Sullivan, an Assistant United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois that sets out the Department's position on the political offense issue. The Department is also providing the Committee with the testimony given by Assistant Legal Adviser Louis G. Fields at the extradition hearing. Both items are responsive to the request in paragraph 2.

3. Paragraph 3 asks for information regarding the question whether the magistrate should have reopened the extradition proceedings to permit counsel for both parties to offer further evidence. The Department of State has no information on this point.

4. Paragraph 4 asks for information regarding the question whether the Extradition Treaty Between the United States and Israel permits the United States to extradite to Israel a citizen of a third country. The Department of State has provided the Committee with a copy of the text of the extradition treaty between the United States and Israel. The Department is also providing the Committee with two letters between Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick and Jordan's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, that are responsive to the requests in paragraph 4.

5. Paragraph 5 asks for information concerning the human rights situation in Israel, particularly with reference to prosecution of Palestinians. The Department of State has provided the Committee with a copy of the Department of State's 1980 Human Rights Report on Israel.

6. Paragraph 6 requests all documents that describe adverse foreign policy repercussions if Ziad Abu Eain is or is not extradited. Mr. Morris Draper of the Department of State explained the foreign policy repercussions during the course of the full Committee hearing on February 26, 1982. His testimony is included in the transcript of the Committee hearing.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1982.
Hon. CLEMENT ZABLOCKI,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter to Secretary Haig of December 11 requesting our comments on H. Res. 300 a resolution on inquiry concerning the extradition of Ziyad Abu Eain which was pending at the time of introduction of the resolution.

As you know, on December 12, 1981, Mr. Abu Eain was surrendered to authorities of the Government of Israel pursuant to a surrender warrant executed by Deputy Secretary Clark. The Deputy Secretary was not aware of H. Res. 300 when he made his decision.

Enclosed is a copy of the Memorandum of Decision signed by Deputy Secretary Clark on December 12 which explains in detail the reasons for his decision. If the Committee desires additional information, the Department of State will be happy to provide it either by briefing members and their staffs, or at a hearing.

I hope that this is responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

RICHARD FAIRBANKS,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION IN THE CASE OF
THE REQUEST BY THE STATE OF ISRAEL FOR
EXTRADITION OF ZIYAD ABU EAIN

SUMMARY AND DECISION

Ziyad Abu Eain is accused by the State of Israel of crimes which are claimed to subject him to extradition pursuant to the current 1963 Extradition Treaty between the United States and Israel. Acting in accordance with that treaty and implementing statutory law, Abu Eain was taken into custody by U.S. officials in response to Israel's request. A Magistrate for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, determined after a hearing that Abu Eain should be extradited to stand trial in Israel. Abu Eain then sought a writ of habeas corpus from the District Court. After review of proceedings before the Magistrate, the petition for the writ was denied. The order of denial was affirmed on appeal by Abu Eain to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Thereafter the United States Supreme Court denied Abu Eain's petition for writ of certiorari.

Abu Eain, having exhausted all avenues of judicial relief, has petitioned the Department of State for relief on grounds hereinafter discussed. Having responsibility to make a final judgment on the question of extradition, I have carefully considered all matters asserted by Abu Eain, his legal counsel and diplomats who have requested opportunity to address the question of extradition. I have concluded that our treaty with Israel and compelling law require a conclusion that Abu Eain be extradited. I have today signed the warrant surrendering Abu Eain to the state seeking extradition.

In contesting extradition, Abu Eain has raised three contentions: the evidence is insufficient to sustain the Magistrate's finding that there is probable cause to believe Abu Eain committed the crimes for which extradition is requested; the crimes charged against him are political offenses and thus are not extraditable crimes; and if extradited, Abu Eain would not receive a fair trial. These all raise legal issues, and none other

than legal contentions have been considered in arriving at today's decision. They will be addressed in the order stated.

PROBABLE CAUSE

The Magistrate's finding of probable cause is based in large part on a statement of Jamal Hasen Ahmad Yasin (Yasin). In that statement Yasin confesses his own responsibility for the crimes charged against Abu Eain and implicates Abu Eain as an accomplice. Abu Eain contends Yasin's statement should not be considered because: (1) Yasin's statement is that of an accomplice and is therefore inherently unreliable; (2) Yasin's statement is not sufficiently corroborated by other evidence; (3) Yasin later recanted the statement insofar as it incriminates Abu Eain; (4) Yasin's statement was transcribed in Hebrew, rather than Yasin's native Arabic, and Yasin is not familiar with Hebrew; (5) the statement was taken under inherently coercive conditions; and (6) the statement is inherently incredible.

To facilitate discussion of these contentions, Yasin's statement will be summarized, and corroborating evidence will then be related.

According to an affidavit signed by Yasin: On May 11, 1979 Yasin drove from his home on the West Bank to Tiberias with the intention of selecting a location in which later to place a bomb. He was accompanied by his friend Abu Eain, whom he that day had enlisted in Al Fatah and in the Tiberias operation. On May 14, Yasin prepared a bomb with a timing mechanism and, after explaining how to set the mechanism, delivered the bomb to Abu Eain with instructions to place it in a refuse bin in Tiberias. Abu Eain left Yasin's home for Tiberias at 9:00 a.m. with the bomb. He returned at 4:30 p.m., stating that he had placed the bomb in a refuse bin in the center of a public market in Tiberias. The next day, May 15, Yasin met with Abu Eain and told him of news reports of a bomb's explosion in a market place in Tiberias, stating that "the operation has succeeded, that two persons had been killed and 36 injured." Sometime thereafter, upon learning that a comrade had been arrested, Yasin told Abu Eain that they were in danger and that Abu Eain should do nothing until contacted by Yasin. Two days later, Yasin's cousin, Mufida Jaber (Jaber), delivered a letter to Abu Eain. Jaber, later still, informed Yasin that Abu Eain had gone to America via Amman, Jordan.

According to an affidavit signed by Jaber (also claimed to have been recanted insofar as it incriminates Abu Eain): An intermediary gave Jaber a note from Yasin to deliver to Abu Eain. The note stated that named persons had been captured, and that Abu Eain should take care. At the time the note was delivered, Abu Eain asked Jaber where Yasin was. When she replied she did not know, Abu Eain told her he wished to go to America via Amman. She later reported Abu Eain's statement to Yasin.

According to an affidavit of an Israeli police officer in charge of investigating the Tiberias bombing: A time bomb hidden in a refuse bin in the center of a market in Tiberias had exploded on the afternoon of May 14, 1979 killing 2 boys and injuring 36 other people sufficiently to require hospital treatment for each of them.

There is also evidence that on May 20, 1979, six days after the bombing, Abu Eain obtained a visa to enter the United States. On June 14, 1979, having travelled via Jordan, Abu Eain arrived in Chicago, Illinois, where he took up residence with his sister and her husband. On August 17, 1979,

when FBI agents went to that residence with a warrant for his arrest, Abu Eain then denied his identity.

Abu Eain's six attacks on the finding of probable cause will next be considered and evaluated.

(1) In response to the assertion that the statement of an accomplice must be deemed unreliable, it is well established that an uncorroborated statement of an accomplice may nevertheless be sufficient to establish probable cause. Indeed, in federal courts even a conviction can be based on uncorroborated accomplice testimony. The credibility of Yasin's statement is enhanced by the fact that it is contrary to his own penal interest; while it incriminates Abu Eain, it also establishes, without in any way mitigating, Yasin's own guilt.

(2) Although sufficient in itself to support a finding of probable cause, Yasin's statement is also corroborated in a number of significant respects. The Israeli investigating officer's statement confirmed that a time bomb placed in a refuse bin in the center of a market in Tiberias had exploded on the afternoon of May 14, 1979 killing 2 and injuring 36. Jaber's statement confirmed that she had delivered a note from Yasin to Abu Eain which stated that named persons had been captured and that Abu Eain should exercise care. Finally, under these circumstances, Abu Eain's flight to America and denial of his identity when first approached by officers in Chicago, although susceptible to innocent explanations, can be viewed as evidence of a consciousness of guilt for purposes of probable cause.

(3) Proffered evidence that both Yasin and Jaber later recanted their original statements insofar as they incriminated Abu Eain, is no more cognizable now than it was in the courts. In upholding the Magistrate's refusal to admit evidence of the alleged recantations, the Court of Appeals stated the well established rule. "An accused in an extradition hearing has no right to contradict the demanding country's proof or to pose questions of credibility as in an ordinary trial, but only to offer evidence which explains or clarifies that proof." To do otherwise would convert an extradition hearing into a full-scale trial, which it is not intended to be. An extradition proceeding is not a trial of the guilt or innocence of an accused but instead has the character of a preliminary examination in a criminal proceeding. Applying this rule, the Court of Appeals held: "The later statements (of Yasin and Jaber) do not explain the government's evidence, rather they tend to contradict or challenge the credibility of the facts implicating petitioner in the bombing. Therefore, the Magistrate properly decided that such a contest should be resolved at trial in Israel. The alleged recantations are matters to be considered at the trial, not the extradition hearing." The considerations underlying the aforementioned rule are as compelling for the Department of State as they are for the courts.

(4) Admittedly, Yasin's first statement (as well as that of Jaber) was transcribed in Hebrew, rather than Yasin's native Arabic. The significance of this fact is nullified in large part by evidence received during the District Court hearing. Such evidence discloses that Judge Shabtay of the Magistrate's Court in Jerusalem questioned both Yasin and Jaber in Arabic, and determined they understood their statements and had made them freely.

(5) While Abu Eain asserts that Yasin's original statement was taken under "inherently coercive circumstances," he admits that Yasin's treatment while detained prior to the confession is "unknown." Indeed, the guarded manner in which this contention is stated—that Yasin's statement was made "apparently without a prior opportunity to consult counsel, family or friend and after an unknown but likely period of weeks of detention"—reveals its own weakness. Moreover, when Yasin allegedly recanted his earlier statement, he did not claim that he had incriminated Abu Eain because he had been coerced in any respect, but rather claimed that he had done so because he thought Abu Eain was safely out of the country.

(6) Finally, the contention that Yasin's original statement is on its face inherently incredible is patently without merit.

THE POLITICAL OFFENSE EXCEPTION

Abu Eain's contention that the crimes charged against him are political offenses—and thus are not crimes for which he can be extradited—was fully considered by the courts. After conducting an extensive hearing on the issue, the federal Magistrate held that the political offense exception was not applicable under the circumstances of this case. The District Court, in denying Abu Eain's petition for writ of habeas corpus, and the Court of Appeals, in affirming the order denying the petition for the writ, expressly agreed with the federal Magistrate's conclusion. The United States Supreme Court, in denying the petition for writ of certiorari, must be deemed to have rejected the claim of the political offense exception.

The standard relied upon by United States courts in determining applicability of the political offense exception is the "political incidence" test. Under that test, a common crime cannot be considered a political offense unless two conditions are first satisfied: the act must have been committed during a political uprising, involving a group of which the accused was a member, and the act must have been "incidental to" that uprising, that is, done in furtherance of or with the intention of assisting it. The placing of a time bomb in a market place with intent to kill civilians cannot be deemed to be "incidental to" a political uprising.

That is and must be the position of the United States. It is hoped that it would be the position of all nations. Anyone contemplating the murder of innocent civilians in a misguided effort to further a political cause must be on notice that he will not be permitted to take refuge under a political offense exception. I do not purport to determine that Abu Eain is in fact such a person. In addressing the issue of whether the political offense exception applies, I now conclude only that the crimes charged—whether or not in fact committed—are not political crimes. While the Department of State is the final arbiter of the question whether a charged crime is within the political offense exception in extradition proceedings, no reason appears in this case why the Department's determination should differ from the judicial determination.

I do not and need not for purposes of extradition make any decision on the question of Abu Eain's guilt or innocence. That determination can be made only by a trial court.

FAIR TRIAL

Concern has been expressed by Abu Eain that he would not receive a fair trial if extradited to Israel. This concern appears to be based in large part on an assumption

that he would be tried in a military court for security offenses.

We are now satisfied that this assumption is without basis. We have been formally assured by the Government of Israel that the crimes charged against Abu Eain—murder, attempted murder and causing bodily harm with aggravating intent—are common criminal charges which will be tried in an ordinary civilian court; that the conditions of Abu Eain's confinement pending trial and the place of his detention will be the same as in the case of any other civilian detainee accused of similar crimes; that he will be entitled to a speedy, public trial and to counsel of his choice; that he will be entitled to confidential interviews with his attorney on any workday during regular hours; that he will be entitled to weekly visits with family members and other persons; that normal rules of criminal procedure and evidence will prevail; and that the burden will be on the prosecution to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. If convicted, Abu Eain would have the right to appeal the decision to the Israeli Supreme Court. Finally, the charges against Abu Eain do not subject him to the possibility of the death penalty. Abu Eain has stated that if he "could be assured of a just trial in an open system, [he] would have nothing to fear." I believe he has those assurances.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I cannot agree with Abu Eain's contentions that there is a lack of probable cause when prevailing law requires that I give consideration to the Yasin statement. Nor can I agree for reasons stated that the crimes charged are within the political offense exception or that Abu Eain will not receive a just and fair trial within a judicial system not unlike our own systems. I thus conclude that compelling law, including our treaty with Israel, requires that I sign the surrender warrant, and I have done so this date.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my explanation, and I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, our dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), for purposes of debate only.

□ 1345

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to associate myself with the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) and to indicate my support for the motion to table which will be offered at the conclusion of this debate.

The resolution, that is the subject of this motion, was jointly referred to the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees and I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ZABLOCKI, for the prompt and thorough attention given to it by his committee.

His committee held 1 day of hearings this week on the resolution and based on the testimony presented by the Departments of State and Justice, which I have reviewed, and the information and documents submitted by the Department of State, which have also been reviewed, I share the gentleman's view that the executive branch is in substantial compliance with the

request made in the resolution of inquiry.

For this reason, I will support the gentleman's motion to table House Resolution 300 and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The resolution pertains strictly to documents in the possession of the Secretary of State, and I believe that the Committee on Foreign Affairs fully discharged its obligation to examine this matter.

I might point out that the Justice Department did inform us that they had not been the repository of any documents or any independent information in this matter.

Therefore, I decided that the Judiciary Committee would not be required to hold any hearings and I felt that the hearing that was conducted by the Foreign Affairs Committee was sufficient.

I would state that, in keeping with the kind of responsibility that falls on the committees to which resolutions of inquiry are referred, I fully share the view of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin and that of his committee that the executive branch has made a good faith effort to comply with the request made in the resolution of inquiry and, as a result, it should be tabled.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Ziad Abu Eain was extradited to Israel after an extensive judicial proceeding in this country. A U.S. magistrate found him extraditable. His finding was reaffirmed by a U.S. district court judge and upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. The U.S. Supreme Court was also petitioned, but after considering full briefs on the issue denied the request for certiorari.

Deputy Secretary Clark, then in that capacity, a man of experience on the bench and of reputation for fairness, made the final decision on granting extradition to this man.

I hope and I expect that after these exhaustive judicial proceedings in this country the Government of Israel, which shares our democratic and judicial tradition, will assure this gentleman a fair trial. There have been deep concerns here about the way in which evidence has been gathered against him.

The confession, signed by another party implicating him, was written in Hebrew, a language that the Palestinian who signed it neither speaks nor understands; and it has since been recanted in writing by the person who made it.

However, Israel has assured the United States that Abu Eain will be tried in a civilian, not a military court, and that he will receive a fair trial.

This is very important. The crimes of which he has been accused are extremely serious—killing two youths in a marketplace. We want to know that he will receive a fair trial. The great interest in this case is obvious evidence that many in the United States will be watching to make sure that this does actually occur.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no further requests for time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS).

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman. I rise, really, for two reasons. I was not aware that this resolution would be presented until this morning at a Whip meeting. Therefore, I did not have time to do the type of research or checking on the background of what brings this resolution to the floor today. Nevertheless, I have great respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan, and I would, therefore, hope in the next few minutes to ask a few questions concerning the resolution; but prior to doing so, I would simply like to comment on the observations made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

The fact that an individual has been charged with extremely serious crimes involving terrorism and involving the killing of innocent civilians, and the fact that there is enough evidence involved that the judicial processes of the United States have resulted in the extradition of that individual would seem to me to be something that is quite important.

We cannot have a double standard when it comes to terrorism. Terrorism and the killing of a civilian innocent population is not an act that we can in any way condone.

Therefore, the actions which have been taken by our Government in this matter, I think, are altogether consistent with our policies, and I am glad they are.

The second point is that based on all of the information I have received, the likelihood of an individual, any individual, receiving a fair trial in the judicial system of the State of Israel is very, very likely. There are a number of countries in the world, including some of Israel's neighbors, where I would have great question whether an individual charged with a similar crime would, in fact, receive a fair trial; but the democratic institutions of the State of Israel, its respect for law, the evidence in the past where the Israeli judicial system has overruled decisions made by the Government on political issues, indicates to me that we have every assurance in

the world that this individual will receive a fair trial.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LEVITAS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. I have listened carefully to what the gentleman has said and I find nothing in his comments with which I disagree. In fact, I concur completely in them.

I think my remarks would tend to establish the same points he has made.

There is apprehension in this country, primarily from Arab-American sources, about this case; but I myself have confidence that the judicial process in Israel will measure up to our expectations and hopes and standards. That is why I take the same position the gentleman does.

Mr. LEVITAS. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois. I am sure he listened carefully to my comments and realizes I was not in any way questioning or disagreeing with him.

I simply wanted to emphasize the point, because of the nature of his resolution, and that brings me very briefly to the last aspect of my request for some time. It has to do, and I apologize for missing the opening remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, because I was on the way over to the floor at the time.

But I would imagine that a resolution of inquiry into an extradition matter is a somewhat unusual, possibly even a unique action by this body. I was wondering if the gentleman, at the risk of perhaps repeating himself, just briefly could explain what is the nature of this extradition that would cause this House to want to engage in this rather unusual procedure.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, this resolution, indeed, does not deal with the subsequent action that has been taken as far as the extradition. The resolution requires of the Secretary of State certain documents in the possession of the Secretary of State, and as I have advised the House and my colleagues, that the Foreign Affairs Committee did, indeed, receive these documents and is satisfied that the resolution of inquiry was satisfied. Nevertheless, by prior arrangement and understanding, the cosponsors have agreed that the resolution of inquiry, House Joint Resolution 300, both committees to whom the resolution was referred would discharge the resolution and I would move to table the resolution.

Mr. LEVITAS. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for that explanation. I am most pleased to realize that my expectations, even without knowing in advance the facts, have been fully confirmed by the fairness and the impartiality and the good judgment of the

gentleman from Wisconsin. I thank him for his explanation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CROCKETT).

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee for yielding that time.

As one of the sponsors of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I want also to express my appreciation to the chairman and to my fellow members of the committee for the very frank, open, and extended hearing that the committee gave on this resolution.

The purpose of the resolution was to suggest to the Congress that there were certain developments in this particular extradition case that warranted a closer look by the Congress itself, either preliminarily to exercising some form of recommendation to the Secretary of State, who had the ultimate authority to decide on extradition, or certainly to determine what, if any, amendments needed to be made to our laws with respect to extradition.

I can say and I can concur with the chairman that the State Department perhaps in anticipation of what we were requesting came to the hearing and brought the documents. Those that they did not bring they have agreed with the chairman that they will submit.

Meanwhile, however, the extraditee has already been shipped back to Israel. I think it would strain imagination to think that this Government is going to ask Israel to return him here, or that if they did ask, that Israel would return him. In other words, I think we are confronted with a fait accompli.

I therefore see no reason whatever in continuing debate on this question and I concur in the chairman's motion to table.

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to table this resolution. The State Department has complied with the request for information contained in this resolution of inquiry. Accordingly this resolution is moot.

Still I must say that I am perplexed by the concern of some of our colleagues over Abu Eain. They object to his extradition on the grounds that the act, of which he is charged, is a political, not a criminal, act.

They are wrong, dead wrong. Abu Eain is accused of an act of terrorism in Tiberias, Israel, in which two young boys were killed. There is little dispute about the facts of the case. The dispute is over the nature of the act. Is it criminal terrorism or is it a form of political expression?

Today, the day on which General Dozier was freed from the clutches of his terrorist captors in Italy, is a good day to redouble our determination to confront the menace of terrorism. It is a peculiarly inappropriate day to find

excuses for it. Terrorism is criminal. It is that simple.

I am glad that Secretary Haig has chosen to deal with the terrorist question and I applaud his decision to extradite Abu Eain.

I submit an article on the Abu Eain case from the New Republic of December 16.

[From the New Republic, Dec. 16, 1981]

TESTING HAIG'S RESOLVE AGAINST
TERRORISTS—THE CASE OF ABU EAIN

Within the next few weeks Alexander Haig must make a decision that will have far-reaching implications for American policy on terrorism. He will pass final judgment on whether a 22-year-old former West Bank resident and PLO member, Ziad Abu Eain, should be extradited to Israel, as the U.S. courts have repeatedly affirmed. It is a decision he will have to make in the face of a huge pressure campaign, by the highest level Arab representatives in the U.S., to persuade the State Department not to banish Eain.

There is no dispute about the basic facts of the case. On May 14, 1979, a terrorist's bomb exploded in the crowded marketplace of Tiberias, where young Israelis were gathering to celebrate the 31st anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. Two young boys were killed, and 30 or more people maimed and injured. Shortly thereafter, Abu Eain fled from Ramallah, his West Bank home, to Jordan, and from there to Chicago, where his sister lived. Acting on information from the Israelis, FBI agents visited Eain in Chicago. He lied about his identity, passing himself off with the name "Kamal Yusuf." Returning to arrest Eain, after they learned that the finger prints of "Yusuf" matched those of Eain, the agents discovered that he had fled. But Eain's brother-in-law soon revealed his whereabouts, and the FBI took Eain into custody. On their first visit, one of the agents had mistakenly believed it was Jordan which sought to extradite Eain; this time Eain told the agents, "It's the Israelis, not the Jordanians that want me."

The Israelis did want Eain. They charged he had set the bomb in the market. Their evidence was the testimony provided by another member of Al Fatah, Jamil Yasin, who had prepared the explosive charge and had accompanied Eain on a trip to Tiberias to find a place to leave it. The Israelis also had the sworn testimony of Yasin's cousin, Mufida Jaber, who acknowledged that she carried a letter from Yasin to Abu Eain, warning him that some of their collaborators had been arrested and that the Israeli authorities might be on his trail. Eain promptly left for the U.S.

With Eain in custody, U.S. Attorney Thomas P. Sullivan began preparing the case for extradition. In doing so, he took an unprecedented step whose ramifications were to be felt far beyond the Eain case. Mindful that "politically motivated" acts are not included in the list of extraditable offenses in the U.S., and mindful, in particular, that an IRA terrorist called McMullen, who is wanted by the United Kingdom for bombing a barrack and killing a charwoman, had recently avoided extradition by arguing that his offense was of a "political character," Sullivan called on the State Department.

The State Department sent Louis Fields, legal adviser for State's Office of Combating Terrorism, as its witness at Eain's extradition hearings. He testified that Eain's of-

fense was a common crime of murder committed against civilians, not a political act. Numerous witnesses appeared on Eain's behalf, including Alexandra Johnson, the former vice consul at the U.S. Consulate in Jerusalem, whose reports about torture in Israel were promptly discredited; and Terry Fleeney, who had served time in Israel for abetting terrorists. Johnson and Fleeney were there to provide testimony that the Israelis routinely tortured Palestinian prisoners. Presiding Magistrate Olga Jurco ruled their observations irrelevant to the case at hand. To contribute a historical perspective, the defense called on Elmer Berger, a rabbi associated with the moribund American Council for Judaism and renowned for his enmity to the very idea of a Jewish state. Berger instructed the court on the history of Zionism—i.e., that it is anti-American, anti-Jewish, anti-universal. Magistrate Jurco ruled, historical perspectives notwithstanding, that Eain be extradited on the grounds that the government had proved probable cause to sustain the charges against him, and that his crime could not be considered a political act. This decision was upheld on March 28, 1980, by U.S. District Court Judge Frank McGarr.

The struggle to prevent the Israelis from bringing Eain to trial had become, and it continues to be a cause célèbre. From the beginning, Eain's legal battle attracted a number of luminaries whose names rank high in the radical left pantheon: Noam Chomsky, Daniel Berrigan, Sidney Lens, David Dellinger. Others who rose to Eain's defense were Frances Fitzgerald, William Sloane Coffin Jr., and I. F. Stone. Did they really know the facts of his case? What had rendered the Eain case worthy of their attentions—its central and significant fact—was that Eain was a Palestinian. He was thus, they argued, a victim rather than the perpetrator of a crime: a victim of Zionism and of Zionist pressures. So, if I. F. Stone speaks for the accused killer, who speaks for the two dead boys? Eain's allies contended that it was torture by the Israelis that had extracted the testimony of Eain's Al Fatah comrade, Yasin. It remained for Ramsey Clark, who made the same claims about Israeli torture in arguing Eain's legal appeal, to voice the political premises underlying all the concerns with civil rights and lack of due process raised by Eain's defenders: "One person's terrorist," Clark told the court, "is another person's freedom fighter."

Judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit heard Ramsey Clark argue that at the time of the bombing Eain was far away in Ramallah, attending the birth of a relative's child. Clark said that 12 of Eain's relatives were prepared to bear witness to this statement, that those accomplices who had testified against Eain had recanted, and that in any case such testimony could only have been obtained under torture by the Israelis. Clark's argument echoed, if somewhat more delicately, the claims of Abu Eain's defense committee that the U.S. courts had been influenced by "Zionist pressures." "We love the Jewish people," Clark told the court. "This bomb went off on the eve of the celebration of Israel's independence. . . . We can't let our biases sway us." The bombing itself, in which explosives had been set in a marketplace crowded with children preparing for a celebration, was, the former U.S. Attorney General explained, "a relatively political act." In arguing the case for the government, U.S. Attorney Thomas P. Sullivan re-

minded the court that the bombing being described thus had resulted in the murder of two young boys.

On February 20, 1981, Judges Wilbur F. Pell Jr., Harlington Wood Jr., and Byron G. Skelton rendered their decision, affirming the lower court's order that Eain be extradited. Harlington Wood Jr. wrote in the opinion that the strong evidence established by the government proved probable cause to believe the defendant had committed the crime for which the Israelis wished to try him. Not only had Eain's accomplice testified to Eain's role in the bombing, but he had incriminated himself as well. And there was Eain's behavior to corroborate the accomplice's testimony: he had fled to Chicago, lied about his identity, fled again when the FBI sought him, and knew that it was the Israelis who wanted him and not, as the FBI agents at first mistakenly thought, the Jordanians.

The most significant aspect of what is sure to be a landmark opinion lies in its assessment of the political offense argument raised by Eain's lawyers to prevent extradition. Judge Wood agreed that the PLO sought the destruction of a civilian populace and that its terrorist activities could be considered a violent political disturbance. The opinion continued:

"If, however, considering the nature of the crime charged, that were all that was necessary in order to prevent extradition under the political offense exception, nothing would prevent an influx of terrorists seeking a safe haven in America. Those terrorists who flee to this country would avoid having to answer to anyone, anywhere, for their crimes. The law is not so utterly absurd. Terrorists who have committed barbarous acts elsewhere would be able to flee to the United States . . . and walk our streets forever free from any accountability for their acts."

Eain's defense exhausted nearly all legal recourses (the Supreme Court refused to hear the case), and the campaign on behalf of Eain has been stepped up considerably. Representatives of virtually every Arab country have expressed their opinions on the matter in Washington. In the United Nations, Jordan and other Arab countries lashed out at U.S. courts, accusing them of committing a travesty of justice and of depriving Eain of due process of law. The Jordanian Ambassador announced that the attempt to extradite Eain to stand trial in Israel was "an offense of the magnitude of the Holocaust."

The State Department attorney said that in his 25 years of experience with the legal profession he had never seen more faithful application of due process than that which had been accorded Eain. "They viciously attack our judiciary and our system of justice; and I will sign an oath in blood that this man has been accorded every due process of law that there is to be accorded." Further, the attorney asserted, despite all the propaganda to the contrary, "there can be no doubt that the Israelis will give Eain a fair trial. Their system of justice is very much like our own." In fact, it is not unusual for Israeli courts to acquit Arabs accused of terrorist acts, precisely because Israel's judicial system—laws of evidence, attorney of defendant's own choosing, appeal to judges with habits of independence, etc.—is very much like ours.

In the Eain case the American judicial system for the first time has come to grips with the question of terrorism. It has explicitly recognized the danger of sanctioning

terrorist activities masquerading as "political action" and the folly of mistaking terrorists for freedom fighters. The opinion in the Eain case recognized that an act of violence directed at civilians amounted to a common crime of murder and thus acknowledged a distinction that the laws of war have made for some time. It is a great irony that so many influential members of the American left should now try further to erode that distinction so vital to civil society. Will the State Department bow to the pressure being applied on Eain's behalf, or will it support the court's decision and unflinchingly identify acts of terrorism for what they are?●

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table House Resolution 300.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) to lay on the table House Resolution 300.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 300, the resolution just debated today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT JANUARY 30, 1982, BE OBSERVED AS A NATIONAL DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE OF POLAND

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 328) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that January 30, 1982, should be observed as a national day of solidarity with the people of Poland.

The clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, and I do so for the purpose of allowing my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, an opportunity to explain this resolution.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber Tuesday night when President Reagan gave his state of the Union address, his first state of the Union address, he did one thing of great significance for the American people and for the people of Poland in asking the Nation that January 30 be

a day of solidarity of the American people with the people of Poland.

□ 1400

This is important, not only for the people of Poland and for the millions of Polish Americans in our country, but for all Americans and all people worldwide who are concerned about freedom and good will. It is in keeping with the bipartisan foreign policy that our former colleague from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, began after the Second World War that I offer this resolution. It simply reiterates the President's statements that

Our sanctions against the military dictatorship that has attempted to crush human rights in Poland—and against the Soviet regime behind that military dictatorship—clearly demonstrated to the world that America will not conduct "business as usual" with the forces of oppression.

And where further, President Reagan urged all peace-loving peoples to join together on that day to raise their voices and speak and pray for freedom.

Last month in the city of Warren, 6,000 people turned out on a freezing, snowy day, to declare their solidarity with the people of Poland. This Saturday, hundreds of thousands of people around this country, through the sponsorship of the American Polish Congress and the AFL-CIO and many other groups, are sponsoring such solidarity days.

One example will take place in the city of Hamtramck, Mich. A program will be sponsored by the city government and the American Polish Congress to demonstrate this solidarity. I commend my colleagues for supporting and cosponsoring this resolution, and I commend the President of the United States for his strong support of the Polish people and their right for freedom.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend my colleague from Michigan for this timely resolution. The meeting will be held on January 30, 1982. It does have strong bipartisan support. I think it is a very worthwhile resolution. I ask for its approval at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HERTEL)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 328

Whereas on December 13, 1981, the ruling military regime in Poland declared martial law in an effort to crush the civil liberties of the Polish people;

Whereas countless members of the only free Polish trade union have been killed, beaten, or jailed;

Whereas President Reagan, in his state of the Union address of January 26, 1982,

stated, "Our sanctions against the military dictatorship that has attempted to crush human rights in Poland, and against the Soviet regime behind that military dictatorship, clearly demonstrated to the world that America will not conduct 'business as usual' with the forces of oppression.";

Whereas numerous groups, including the American Polish Congress and the AFL-CIO, have designated January 30, 1982, a day of solidarity with the people of Poland; and

Whereas President Reagan urged "all peace loving peoples to join together" on that day, "to raise their voices, to speak and pray for freedom"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that January 30, 1982, should be observed by the people of the United States as a national day of solidarity with the people of Poland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HERTEL) is recognized for 1 hour in support of his resolution.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the schedule for the balance of the week and for next week.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I would be very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, for the balance of this week, the House meets at 11 a.m. on Friday, January 29. There will be no legislative business.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of February 1, 1982, is:

Monday, the House is not in session.

Tuesday, February 2, the House meets at noon to consider the Private Calendar. There are no suspensions.

The House will consider H.R. 4481, Justice Assistance Act of 1981, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

The House meets at 3 p.m. on Wednesday and 11 a.m. the balance of the week.

Any further program will be announced later. The House will adjourn by 3 p.m. on Friday, and 5:30 p.m. on all other days except Wednesday. Conference reports may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. I have just one question for the gentleman.

There is no further program announced for Wednesday and the balance of the week. Does the gentleman at the present time anticipate pro forma sessions throughout the balance of the week?

Mr. MURTHA. We will not know until next Wednesday.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1982

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House convenes on Tuesday next, it convene at noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1982, TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1982

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, January 29, 1982, it adjourn until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO A GREAT AMERICAN LEGISLATOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker and Members, I think it is entirely fitting that on the day we honor a great American President, we also honor a great American legislator.

Some weeks ago, we were all disappointed to learn that RICHARD BOLLING, the chairman of our Rules Committee, is choosing a career change after 34 years of service in the House of Representatives. Trying to analyze the impact our colleague, DICK BOLLING, has had on this House is an awesome challenge, indeed. In fact, it may not be possible. His impact is not merely a reflection of the fact that he has been here longer than nearly all of us, although he has, nor does it grow out of his view which has recently gained a lot of popularity that Government must be the efficient servant of the people with an equal emphasis placed both on efficiency and on service.

My suspicion is that DICK BOLLING's influence is a natural outgrowth of the wide range of his interests and his skill at communicating them. Historically, many Members have concentrated on the major issues of the day. A smaller group has emphasized the internal and organizational problems that preclude efficient congressional operations. DICK BOLLING's genius lies in the fact that he has simultaneously become an effective leader of both groups.

Our current budget process is largely his invention. We have become increasingly aware of its flaws in the past few years, but I know of no one who would deny that it is a significant improvement over the chaos that was previously the norm.

But DICK BOLLING has been a thinker as well as a doer. He was one of the first to realize that so-called reform could lead to political paralysis and cripple traditional party activity. This was a provocative assertion coming from someone who began his career by successfully challenging a well oiled political machine, but it proved to have merit.

He has not won all of his battles. No one does. But he has prevailed in a good share of them, and he has often been subsequently proven right by events, despite a loss on a particular issue.

It may be that few Americans realize the impact that DICK BOLLING has had on all of our lives. But I am confident that all of my colleagues here are aware of it. Beyond that, I owe him a personal debt that I will never be able to fully repay.

When I first came to Washington, DICK BOLLING generously shared the advice that was distilled from decades of experience here. In a way, I felt like I was standing on his shoulders as I scanned the scene here. He was equally generous with the influence he had amassed.

One major reason my service in this House has been so fulfilling is the initial interest DICK BOLLING took in me, and I know that I am not unique in this regard.

So I begin this special order today with a sadness that this is DICK BOLLING's last year in the Congress, and a gladness that his role here is being recognized by all of us who will miss him here. Because of DICK BOLLING's service in Congress, our political institutions are more responsive, and our Nation is healthier. He has been quick to criticize, but he has been equally strong in arguing that politics is an honorable profession, and that we all share a common goal—serving the people. Or, as he put it in one of his books, and I quote:

The political leader is vastly different from that of a philosopher, political theorist or anyone who tries to analyze social problems and develop proposed solutions. All of these can and should be purists, seeking the ideal solution. The political leader's role is to achieve an effective solution.

He has constantly prodded us to adopt such solutions and he has often succeeded. He has had a proud history in this House, and has helped all of us to do our jobs better. I think each one of us wishes him a happy and healthy future, and we feel assured that he will continue to contribute his wisdom, his energy and his experience to the United States of America.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR.)

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I took some comfort on my last birthday in reminding myself that Chairman BOLLING was already serving in the House when I was 3 years old. When I noticed that he was back in the office within 3 weeks of his open heart surgery, however, I was forced to rethink that comparison.

When I arrived in the Congress in 1977, DICK BOLLING was one of the first Members to earn my respect because of his hard work and intricate knowledge of the House. Having had the opportunity to work under his leadership on the Rules Committee, I have witnessed another dimension to his character: his abiding sense of fairness.

During the partisan debates of last year, even his most ardent adversaries must have respected that attribute. That is not to say that DICK BOLLING is not partisan—he is deeply committed to the Democratic Party and its principles. But his fairness is driven by an insuperable respect for the institution of the House and the form of government from whence its power derives. Even when others in this body were doing violence to the traditions and principles of the House, he remained committed to orderly, open, and dignified deliberations and at times it may have worked to his short-term disadvantage.

His many accomplishments testify to his value to his constituents and his country. However, it is the example of this deep respect for the House as an institution that he leaves as a special gift to those of us that labor in its Chambers.

Those who opt for the expediency of opportunism at the expense of principle, for short-term success over prudent deliberacy, for exploitation over fairness are either remembered in infamy or are remembered not at all. Those who strive for the strengthening of the democratic process regardless of the temporary vicissitudes of politics are remembered in the regretfully brief list of statesmen. I am confident that it is to this latter group that history will assign RICHARD BOLLING. We thank him for his leadership and wish him the best in "life after Congress."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I am pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I was privileged, as were other Members who assembled here in the joint session with the other body to honor a late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for the leadership that he provided this Nation.

□ 1415

Today we honor a man for the leadership he has provided the House of Representatives, RICHARD BOLLING of Missouri. He is my neighbor, as a resident of Missouri, and he is my friend and adviser.

As a new Member to this body, some 14 years ago, I quickly decided those persons on whom I could depend during difficult times in serving in this body. I turned to DICK BOLLING for his knowledge of the complex mechanism that permits an institution of 435 Members to function and to operate, which is in itself an achievement in democracy. He is known by all of us as an individual who respects his institution and who has a sense of purpose about the direction in which it should proceed.

RICHARD BOLLING, in my view, is one of the giants that have served in this Congress. There are others that I have known, such as Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, who is referred to in our own State as "the last of the Titans." I think that, as the institution has changed and the kinds of people who come here have changed, RICHARD BOLLING will be remembered as one who has provided leadership and direction during times of change to all of us who needed that leadership, that knowledge, that direction, and that sense of purpose.

I am saddened that he is leaving. I was surprised by his announcement that he would not seek reelection, but I am as confident as other Members of this body are that we will still be able to rely upon RICHARD BOLLING for the kind of leadership and advice that he has given all of us in the past, because I feel certain that he will write and that he will share his wisdom and his sense of purpose with all of us. I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am moved to speak in part by the words that the gentleman in the well himself expressed. I am not deeply touched by Mr. BOLLING's departure. I think he has been here long enough, probably. I feel that way about myself, of course. But, the gentleman in the well referred to the fact that when he first arrived here, he felt that he was standing on Mr. BOLLING's shoulders, and the previous speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, referred to him as a giant. There is an interesting history of this terminology. The great scientist, Sir Isaac Newton, was once being complimented on his great contribution—and he is truly one of the probably three or four great scientific leaders that the world has produced—and in all modesty he said that he was not entitled to the credit that was being bestowed upon him because he himself stood upon the shoulders of giants.

That is an appropriate term to use for RICHARD BOLLING. He is one of the giants on whose shoulders I have stood and you have stood and many others, and because he is a modest man, I am sure he would give credit to the other great leaders upon whose shoulders he has stood. But you do not stand on the shoulders of pygmies; you stand on the shoulders of giants, and the important thing is that there have to be giants who are sufficiently concerned with both the people and the future, whose concerns span a broad spectrum of the concerns of our society in order that they may learn from the past and transmit to the future the wisdom that is necessary to solve the problems of the day.

Though I have never been very close to Mr. BOLLING—he is rather obnoxious when you get to know him—I have benefited from that knowledge, from that contact, and as the gentleman has indicated, in more cases than not, I have found that he had a wisdom beneath that gruff exterior which overshadowed his faults. I am proud to pay tribute to this contribution.

I say that I have no particular sense of regret because I really expect his

contributions in the future toward solving the problems that face us will be even greater than they have been in the past, and I look forward with anticipation to that. I hope to benefit from it, because I know that he will not be restrained in what he says. I know that he will distill the essence of what he has learned from these years here, and make it available to an even broader audience. I think the country as a whole can be happy and proud that this is the situation. I pay tribute to a great man.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI).

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the very outset, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri for taking this time and making it possible for us to pay tribute to a great American. I consider it a real privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the long and honorable public career of DICK BOLLING as we begin the last year in which he will be serving in this body—as always with great distinction.

DICK BOLLING and I were first elected to the House in the same year, 1948, and consequently, our association is one of long standing. Perhaps, however, I should note for the record that, like President Reagan, neither one of us were present during the administration of George Washington.

In any case, those of us who have worked with the gentleman from Missouri, DICK BOLLING, for as many years as I have, recognize his strong leadership, his great intelligence, and above all, his enduring commitment to the ideals which have guided him in his outstanding service to this body and to the Nation.

These are the qualities, moreover, that have distinguished his chairmanship of the Rules Committee in the 96th and 97th Congresses. They also characterize his service on the Joint Economic Committee, and during the 1950's, on the Banking Committee.

These characteristics also were in evidence in his, shall I say, private or political life. I recall earlier in our careers, when we were just young freshman, DICK BOLLING had agreed to come to our community of Milwaukee—and I say "ours," because at that time we had another colleague, Congressman Andrew Biemiller, who represented the fifth District of Wisconsin. It was upon his invitation that DICK BOLLING came to Milwaukee to attend a picnic. Just to attend a picnic of a political nature takes courage, especially in Milwaukee.

I am not sure whether DICK BOLLING remembers this. Somehow he got to Milwaukee although I am not sure

how. In those days, air travel was not as convenient as it is today and Milwaukee was not that accessible from Missouri. Nevertheless, along around 7:30 on Sunday morning, I got a call from DICK BOLLING advising me that he was in town. I went over to pick him up. He must have traveled all night to get there because he was really very tired.

So, I said to DICK, "Would you rather have breakfast or would you rather have a nap?"

I knew he needed a nap more. He agreed—"Well, I will stretch out a bit."

I decided to prepare breakfast since my wife was not home. I fried bacon—Cudahey bacon, made in Milwaukee, by the way—and eggs. I made a pot of fresh coffee, and I just got this coffee to where the aroma was best when into the kitchen walked DICK BOLLING. He said, "I am not as tired as I thought I was. I will have that breakfast now."

I must confess that that was the first time I tested out my culinary art on a colleague. Fortunately, he survived.

Seriously, though, let me say that, in my judgment, his most lasting contribution to the proceedings of this body was his role as chairman of the Select Committee on Committees in 1973, which produced the set of bipartisan recommendations on the organization and structure of our House committees, which was of major, and I believe, of historic significance.

The great State of Missouri has been called the "show me" State, and DICK BOLLING has shown all of us that national elective office can be a honorable and rewarding profession. His incisive wit, his idealism, and his wisdom will be missed in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, since time does not permit me to list all of Mr. BOLLING's major accomplishments, I merely want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman for his contribution to the work of the House, and to offer him and his family a happy and richly deserved retirement. We will miss you, DICK.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with so many others in honoring our good friend and distinguished colleague, DICK BOLLING, who has announced his retirement at the end of this year.

Throughout the years, there have not been many major issues on which DICK and I have agreed. I am sure DICK has often wondered how BOB MICHEL could reach the political conclusions I have. And I can tell you the

same thought has passed through my mind about him.

But the fact of the matter is that while DICK BOLLING and I have disagreed on politics, we have never disagreed as to the basic principles underlying debate and orderly procedure in this House.

DICK BOLLING is truly a "man of the House." He loves this institution. He not only abides by its rules but lives and acts by them in the way he conducts himself in committee, on the floor, in debate, and wherever he has been called upon to preside over this House.

As is well known, DICK has been in the forefront of those who seek to make this great institution work a little better.

He is, and has been, a champion of those who sought to streamline jurisdictional matters among our committees. I am glad to say I cosponsored his legislation for a "Little Hoover Commission" for more effective government.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, while DICK BOLLING and I have disagreed when it comes to issues, we are in perfect agreement when it comes to the need to make our system work better for the people.

As a Republican, I guess I ought to say I am glad to see the Democrats lose the services of such a tough and talented antagonist. But as an American, I have to say that this place is not going to be the same without DICK BOLLING's forthright, direct, no-nonsense style.

And on a much more personal note, I am proud to have had the privilege to serve with DICK BOLLING for so many years and to have my life enriched by that association.

My best wishes go out to him in whatever course he chooses to pursue in his retirement from this body.

□ 1430

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUQUA).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take the opportunity today arranged by Congressman GEPHARDT, to honor an outstanding leader, DICK BOLLING, whose distinguished career in the House is unsurpassed. His vision, hard work, and intellect will be greatly missed, but the legislative handiwork which bears his stamp, and the basic fairness embodied in the House rules he helped to craft will serve us well for future years. Since men are often best remembered for the institutions they create, it is very correct to say that the House of Representatives and the Congress is the institution it now is, in large measure, because of his never ending pursuit of democratic principles and procedures to serve it. He has

also indeed had an exceptional influence on the development of the Democratic Party, both as a team player on the Rules Committee and as a student of the Congress.

DICK BOLLING is a man who likes to take on the tough issues. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 serves as an early example of this principle. Many of us now in this Chamber were just getting started in politics in those days, and it is with great admiration that I recall how truly enormous was the effort it took to enact national legislation of such stature in those days.

Another tough issue was committee reform, and the opening of the process to every Member, sometimes at the expense of those who had already achieved an important position. Some early chapters on the "BOLLING Committee," as we call it, and its work to modernize the House and bring the work of its several committees into better balance have already been written. The Committee on Science and Technology which I am privileged to chair is one of the many beneficiaries of the painstaking efforts led by DICK BOLLING. As a result of his efforts the House did give responsibility for civilian research and development to one committee and thus equipped itself to deal with one of the key issues on our national agenda: The role of science and technology, and the contributions which can be made by that sector to increased innovation and productivity. In addition, as a key figure on the Rules Committee for many years and more recently as its chairman, he has been instrumental in seeing that the referral mechanisms put in place by House Resolution 988 were properly and fairly adhered to. The product of this stewardship has been better legislation, and it would not have been possible without DICK BOLLING.

Equally tough to grapple with has been the tying together in the Congress of the spending side with the requirement to levy taxes. The 1974 Budget and Improvement Control Act bears his stamp and is in large measure the product of his foresight. Since the implementation of the act is still a matter of relative newness the full impact of the goals and procedures it establishes is very much in the center of today's political arena. The linkage of spending authority and taxing authority had changed the whole nature of our political debate and given national attention to the very essential work we do here and its impact on our economy. DICK BOLLING is a liberal who believes in fiscal responsibility—to me that sums it up.

I also admire DICK BOLLING very much for his labors as an author, as a student of the Congress, and because of his seeming fascination with macroeconomics, nurtured by years of service on the Joint Economic Committee.

His most recent book, "America's Competitive Edge" deals with the very subject of such great concern to me and to the Science and Technology Committee, and illustrates yet again the breadth and depth of his intellect. The book offers a definite program to bring about the renewal of America's economic strength and displays an impressive grasp of the key role for science and technology.

DICK BOLLING has unselfishly served in the finest tradition, his constituents and his institution. We will miss him.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

Mr. RHODES. I thank my good friend from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for yielding. I am pleased to take a moment and join my colleagues in paying tribute to a very good personal friend, DICK BOLLING, and to thank him for his many years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives.

Dick has been here about 33 years and he has lent his abundant talents to setting some of the Nation's most momentous issues. His tactical skill and thorough understanding of the workings of this House has made him one of the most formidable legislators and debaters to have ever labored in this Chamber. Many are the battles in which I would like to have had Dick's knowledge and skill on my side. But, you know, in some of them we did fight side by side and we have shared many of the same ideas in the field of congressional reform.

As has been said before, he has had many fine hours. But I think his finest hour was as chairman of the Committee on Congressional Reform some years ago which brought forth, I thought, a really momentous report, and one which I tried, as did many others, to have adopted. I cannot help but believe that the work of the House would have certainly been enhanced insofar as not only quality but speed of enactment is concerned had we been able to triumph.

I believe DICK BOLLING has probably had as much influence on the House as any contemporary Member, and I know his absence will be felt acutely when he retires at the end of this session. But as one who has made a similar decision and will be leaving the Congress with him, I am just as certain that he will continue his notable contribution to the art of government as I hope to do through lecturing and writing.

I could go on and on with laudatory remarks about this remarkable man but if I say too much he might lose some of the esteem of his Democratic colleagues. I suspect that he did when I lauded him in a little book which I wrote a few years ago and did not

treat some of his colleagues with equal kindness. I hope he has recovered from that and I assure him that what I said at that time I feel just as strongly as I did then.

One of the nicest things that has happened to me after I got out of the minority leadership was to be able to serve on the great Committee on Rules and to serve under the chairmanship of DICK BOLLING. He has an absolute fascination for the rules of this House. I might say he is also intrigued by some of the things that one can do to them every now and then and, in fact, he has taught a few of us some tricks which I am sure will live either in fame or infamy but, nevertheless, they will live.

One of the things which I would regret if I were staying is that Dick would not be here. But I cannot say that.

But I do want to thank him again and I guess thank the good Lord, too, for the service of people like DICK BOLLING in this great Republic of ours.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding and am pleased to join in the tribute of my colleagues to this distinguished individual. He is truly a giant of this institution and it is appropriate that we honor him on the same day we pay tribute to another giant of our times.

The House is an interesting institution and the Members of the House have many different qualities that sometimes we admire and other qualities that we do not admire. The qualities of honesty, integrity, knowledge, are qualities we admire. The qualities of those who are perhaps coarse or direct or at times obnoxious we do not admire.

DICK BOLLING is someone who possesses all of those qualities. But that is not what DICK will be remembered for.

There are two key qualities that I think are extremely important to what DICK BOLLING is all about. One has already been mentioned here. It is the respect for the institution. There surely is no other Member who holds the kind of respect for this institution that DICK BOLLING has or who has contributed to keeping this institution a vital part of our democracy. That is really what he is about and that is what he will be remembered for, his dedication to the institution.

During the time we were having many meetings on reconciliation and the budget process generally, DICK BOLLING constantly asked the question: "What does this mean in terms of the process? What does this mean in terms of the institution?"

Because of those questions we were able to keep that process on track with the institution and with its goals.

DICK BOLLING is an anchor. He is an anchor for the institution and he is an anchor for our system of government.

There is another quality that has not been mentioned here that I think is just as important. DICK BOLLING is also a revolutionary in the best sense of the word. Yes, he has a respect for the institution, but he also understands that the institution is not static, that it must be vibrant, that it must look to new ideas, that it must look to changes in our system. If our society is changing, if our needs are changing, then the institution has to respond to those needs. He is not so stuck in the mud in terms of the institution that he is not willing to consider those ideas.

It is for that reason that I think younger Members like myself and Dick and others have really appreciated his presence because he is not only important in terms of the institution but he respects new ideas and he wants to listen.

So it is those two qualities, respect for the institution and the revolutionary quality to listen to new ideas and to be able to modify this institution to respect those new ideas that I think DICK BOLLING will be remembered.

He will always, whether he is here or whether he is outside of this body, he will always be an anchor for this institution and he will also be an anchor for those new Members who come into this body and want to share in those qualities that he will leave with us for a long time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I yield to my friend from Missouri (Mr. COLEMAN).

Mr. COLEMAN. I thank my colleague for yielding and would like to rise and also pay tribute to the gentleman who shares with me the distinction of representing the city of Kansas City, Mo., in the U.S. Congress.

RICHARD BOLLING is not only our senior Member from Kansas City, he is the senior member of the Missouri delegation, the dean of our delegation. His continuity and his oversight and views of what has happened here in the last 33 years has certainly set well with those of us who are new Members of the Congress in the last 5 or 6 years as we understand what preceded us and hopefully what impact we might have on this body as we go forward.

I suppose I am the only person in the House who was a constituent of DICK BOLLING. For 21 years DICK BOLLING was my Congressman, since the age that I was 5 until I was 26 years of age. In that period of time, which are formative years, I was able to firsthand witness what a Congress-

man can do. Frankly, it gave me I think some incentive to run for the House one day, not against DICK BOLLING but in an adjacent district which I reside in now and have since 1969.

DICK BOLLING started constituent services, I think, before it was fashionable or even politically necessary to get reelected. I recall the little things that our Congressman used to do. If your name appeared in the paper, as occasionally it might, he would be sure and let you know that he saw it and he would hand-sign a little note to that effect. A lot of us do that now, but it was not done 20 years ago as it is today.

I recall the things that Kansas City is proud of that DICK BOLLING has done for them. I think it is very easy to be a national politician or a national figure and forget exactly where you come from. But DICK BOLLING has had the personal touch and he has fought hard for Kansas City.

I remember I believe the 1964 campaign in which Dick's campaign poster was a picture of the Congressman and behind him was the skeleton start of what is not our Federal Regional Office Building in Kansas City. I am sure that Congressman BOLLING had a great deal to do with having that regional office there in Kansas City with the hundreds of people who work in that office building and who provide services for many other States and communities, but especially for Kansas City.

His personal touch was also there. I know friends of mine, Republican friends, who tell about DICK BOLLING showing up on election morning in a south Kansas City precinct and being able to name off and call by first name his constituents as they come in to vote. That is a very difficult thing to do in a highly urbanized area and one which I think pays tribute to the gentleman to remember the very people who elected him that he has gone back to.

As a college student I applied to my Congressman for a summer internship, as I recall. I did not get it. But I wrote him a letter and told him what a job I thought he was doing and, frankly, I forgot it. I was elected to Congress in 1967 and visited with DICK BOLLING. Either he has a great storehouse of knowledge or he has a great retrieval system, because he remembered the letter that the college student wrote him 15 years earlier and some of the remarks that I had made in it. For whatever reason, he remembered, I think it is a personal touch that a Congressman of his stature, who did not need to have that kind of personal touch, frankly, has continued to have.

I remember in 1964 also, as the Congressman does, that he was challenged by the factions of Kansas City, by the vestiges of the old Pendergast machine that ran Kansas City and made it no-

torious through the years. They went after DICK BOLLING in probably his only really tough reelection. This was not the general election but the primary in the Democratic Party. I was in New York at the time and I remember going down to Times Square to pick up a copy of the newspaper that night to see what happened in the primary in Kansas City. Yes, it was national news and it was in the New York Times because DICK BOLLING is a national figure.

He survived that election. He defeated them soundly and has gone on with virtually very little opposition since in either the general or primary elections.

DICK BOLLING has a broad view of government. He has a broad view of this House as an institution. I hope, and I know I speak for the citizens of Kansas City, that we hope that he will continue to share his views and his life with those of us in our community and that he will continue to play an important role in our community and come back again and tell us his views and his position and give us another history lesson so that we may learn from the past and from his experiences so that we can have a better country in the future.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me and thank him very much.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this special order today.

I think DICK BOLLING leaving this institution means one thing very clearly. We are losing our best man.

I think it is fitting that JOHN RHODES was here earlier because I think JOHN and DICK share one quality in great abundance. They both are institutional men. I think that DICK BOLLING understands and has communicated more effectively and more thoroughly than anyone else in this institution the key role that structure plays in the legislative process and the key role that character plays in the legislative process.

I remember seeking him out after I was elected to this body on April 1, 1969. I remember sitting next to him many, many times when he was seated in the seat in which he is sitting right now, asking him about the institution, asking him about his own view of history, asking him about all of the things that one asks about if they are trying to understand how to function in this place.

□ 1445

I think there were two ways that he was most helpful to me: No. 1, in understanding or developing a better understanding and a better sense of history; and, second, he also placed great

emphasis on the necessity to build coalitions, because without building coalitions you cannot get anything done either in this institution or in this country.

He reminds me very much, in an historical sense, of the person who I believe to be the finest public servant Wisconsin has ever produced. Most people, when they hear that, think that you are talking about Robert LaFollette, Sr. And I am not. I happen to have the view that the most distinguished public servant my State has ever produced was Robert LaFollette, Jr. I think he was one of the progressives who understood the necessity to involve this country internationally at a time when many people of his political stripe did not have that understanding. He also understood the need for change in the legislative bodies, to make them move with the times. I think that DICK reflects both of those understandings as clearly as anyone I know.

I know that some people from time-to-time have thought that DICK BOLLING was perhaps a touch too acerbic for his own good and for the good of the institution. I very much disagree with that. I think that this institution, like many others, needs a little acid to cut through the phoniness and to cut through the irrelevancies which we see here and in any other institution from time-to-time, just as it needs a little balm to heal over differences which occur when people hold strongly held views.

I think, without a doubt, he is the greatest Member of Congress I have ever served with. He is certainly, in historical terms, the greatest Member of this House in modern history who never became Speaker. I voted for him for majority leader, and the reason I voted for him was because I thought he belonged to a type that we badly need in this institution. There are really two kinds of people: somebody who wants the job because they want the title, and somebody who wants the title so that they can do the job. And DICK BOLLING falls in that latter category. I think that, more than any other reason, is why so many people have had such great respect for him through the years.

I think all of us, more than anything else, want at the end of our career to have it said of us that we made a difference. And more than any other individual I have ever known in this institution, DICK BOLLING has made a difference. He has made a difference on issues ranging from the organization of this place itself to the great moral issue of our time, the civil rights issue. He certainly has a sense of compassion which has moved this institution on a whole range of issues that made this country better for the people we represent. He has recog-

nized that the job of a Member of Congress is really threefold: You have to be a legislator, you have to be a service agent for your district, and you also have to be a public educator. I think many times that last quality is the most important. Again, I know of no Member of the House who has done a better job on that crucial task of educating not only the public but our own colleagues than has DICK BOLLING. He has been a friend to me. He has been a leader for me. He has been a stern taskmaster for all of us. I think all of us are the better for it. It is fitting, as the gentleman from California indicated, that we discuss his career here on the same day that we pay tribute to the man who, in my judgment, is the third greatest man that this country has ever had, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

While I do not remember the quotation exactly, I think DICK's whole approach to public service recognizes that he did take to heart F. D. R.'s admonition, if I can characterize it rather than quote it, that says "Better the government which commits an occasional sin in the name of its concern for people than the sins of omission committed by a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference." I think DICK BOLLING's whole career indicates that, above all, he is not indifferent, not to the institution, not to the country and, most certainly, not to the individuals for whom the country was created.

We are losing our best man. I very much regret it, on both a professional and personal level. I do know that he still has much to contribute to the country, and I consider it the greatest privilege of my life to have served with him.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CONABLE).

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, for holding this special order, giving us the opportunity that we have today. I frequently shrink from such an opportunity, for fear of sounding trite. If there is anybody who is entitled to more than the usual trite expressions of respect that are frequent here at retirement, it is DICK BOLLING. This institution depends very strongly for its vitality on the frequent infusion of new ideas. But the House also depends on the cement that can keep that dynamic ideas from tearing us apart. And the cement that holds this institution together is usually respect. Over his service here DICK BOLLING has contributed a great deal to the new ideas which enliven this institution, and he has also been an important part of this cement of respect.

We are all aware of his understanding of the process, his love of it, his inquiring mind and his directness in trying to put his ideas into effect. So his contributions to the vitality of this institution, I think, are signal.

Also, however, the cement that he has provided has been an awfully important part of the intensity and cohesion of this institution. We are by nature transients. There are comparatively few of us who stay as long as DICK BOLLING has stayed. During his entire service here he has been a central figure, not because of the positions he has held—although he has held important positions—but because of his personality and his character and the strength of his intellect. As a central figure, he has been widely respected, even by those who have disagreed with him, and they have never had any doubt of their disagreement because DICK has never compromised his views in ways that would leave people uncertain as to where he stands.

In addition to the personal respect with which he is held, his respect for the institution has also been an important part of the cement. His love of the House, the extent to which he is the prototype of the best in House membership has been an example for many others. Without such an example, we can acquire institutional respect only through long service in this institution. Through the example of people like DICK BOLLING we get a quicker sense of the importance of institutional stability, institutional growth, and institutional understanding. His love of the House is infectious and transferable.

I have heard him described as an institutional man. I am sure that he knows as much about the House of Representatives as all the rest of us put together. He is a student of its process. His mind has reached into all of the aspects of our institutional history. In that sense, he is an institutional man. But while those who do not know him may easily think of him as an institution, those who do know him cannot think of him except in warmly human terms. He is not a man who inspires neutrality. The strength of his personality belies any effort to categorize him as just some sort of a fraction of an institution. In a human institution, he is a preeminent human being.

There is a lot to be said about DICK BOLLING. We all are going to be diminished by his departure. As a central figure, he has been for many of us a yardstick with which to measure our own smaller contributions. That is a unique role that few of us can make.

He knows that he is not indispensable because he has the sense of this body that it must go on. But he also knows that he has made a contribution, because he is aware of the atti-

tude of his colleagues. It is not necessary to belabor that respect, that affection, that sense of his contribution, further here today.

There is a life after Congress. We all know that. I think that life will be a rich one for anybody with DICK's abilities and qualities and inquisitiveness. His citizenship, in whatever way it manifests itself, will continue to be a national asset, and I think he knows that he goes out from here leaving behind many people who are grateful for not just his service, not just his relationship to the institution, but the warm and the personal friendship that is possible for such a man to have in wide numbers in whatever institution with which he is associated.

□ 1500

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, so many fine things have been said about DICK BOLLING that it would be impossible to top any of them. I guess I have one great regret, as DICK BOLLING leaves here, that I ought to express right now, and that is the regret that while he has been here I have not followed him as closely as I should.

If a poll were taken of this House as to who is the most admired and respected, I think there is no doubt in my mind that it would be DICK BOLLING. He has a dedication and a purpose about all of his actions. I think that dedication and purpose means that he is committed to the idea that free people can govern themselves in a democratic manner through a body such as the House of Representatives.

He has contributed so importantly to this body that only history will ever be able to fully understand what he has done. But it is important not only to this body, but to other legislative bodies through the 50 States and, in fact, throughout the world, because what happens here is often emulated in our States and emulated throughout the world.

So, DICK, as you sit there and contemplate what your accomplishments have been, as we try to enumerate them, I want you to know that this one Member respects you and has a great deal of affection for you and has a great deal of admiration for what you have accomplished in the time that you have been here.

DICK, we need more people like you, but I do not think there is a mold that has been preserved like you.

So, we wish you well. We know you will continue to contribute, and we hope that Missouri or some other part of the Nation will send us another DICK BOLLING real soon.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman and I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDD).

Mr. RUDD. I thank my colleague for yielding and also express my appreciation for his thoughtfulness in taking this very important and very special, special order for today for DICK BOLLING.

I consider DICK to be a very highly respected leader of the House of Representatives and also to be a formidable Congressman in action on the floor of the House of Representatives.

When he makes up his mind to take a course of action he will not be swerved, and if he feels he is right he is completely dedicated in pursuing that course of action.

Speaking for myself alone, as a Member of this body, he is one Member that gets my attention immediately and holds it, and I think that that in itself is a great compliment to the man himself.

I have enjoyed knowing him personally and I have especially been very pleased to observe him as an example of what a very successful, very effective Congressman should be in action, and he has been a lesson to me in that regard, and that in itself is appreciated very much.

I know that there have been a lot of nice things said about DICK today by people who have known him for a number of years, and I wish that I may have had a closer relationship with him so that I could observe more closely what he has done in action, and I wish him well in all of his future endeavors, and again I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this special order.

A TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BOLLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to join in the second part of this special order with my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), in paying tribute to Hon. RICHARD BOLLING, who has announced his retirement from this body.

I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, I was a 17-year-old high school senior coming to Washington, D.C., to see President Harry Truman inaugurated in January of 1949. On the train coming up here I remember very well people talking about their new Congressman from Kansas City, DICK BOLLING. I did not meet him then but I heard good things about him then, and it was my pleasure in later years to get to know him, to call him a friend, and to serve with him in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, he is a gentleman of great stature. He is one who has always had the time to give advice to a friend, and I might say that one of his greatest attributes with all of his talents and all of his work and all of his skill is the loyalty that he has displayed to his friend, the encouragement, the word of "You can do it," the suggestion on how to do it better. These have been his hallmarks from a friend's point of view.

I remember on one occasion when seeking advice from him he said there are two ways to look at things. One way is negative and the other is positive. He said, "I prefer the positive."

That has been his rule through the years.

Mr. Speaker, DICK BOLLING is a man of great talents. If you have been so blessed with the talents as this gentleman from Missouri, and like the Good Book said, one is not to hide those talents, one is not to hide his light under a bushel and, Mr. Speaker, DICK BOLLING has not hidden his talents, but he has been a meteor to light the skies in our period of history.

I am proud to call him my friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, when our good friend and colleague RICHARD BOLLING leaves the House next year after 34 years in Congress, it will mark the end of one of the most distinguished and remarkable careers in the history of this legislative body. During these 17 terms in Congress, DICK BOLLING has rendered superlative service to the people of the Kansas City area, the State of Missouri, and the Nation. No Member of Congress in our lifetime has done more for Congress as an institution. His influence has been profound, positive, and lasting.

As a legislator, DICK BOLLING is a keen strategist, a peerless coalition builder, and a master of the House rules and procedures. Reforms that made the House more democratic and responsive, civil rights legislation, and the Budget Act are all evidence of his skill and energy. Yet, I believe his most lasting monument will be his efforts to preserve the integrity of the House as an institution. Throughout his career, he has recognized, as perhaps no other legislator in our time, that Congress must exercise its responsibilities as a coequal branch of Government in order for our system to flourish. At the same time, he has been in the forefront of efforts to make the House and its procedures more accountable, more open, and more responsive to the people we were elected to serve. His work in this area has won him the admiration and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the press, and the public. It is safe to say that this House of Representatives is a far greater institution for DICK BOLLING's having served here.

As a new Member of Congress in 1977, I appreciated DICK BOLLING's willingness to share the benefits of his experience, and I appreciated his wise counsel on complicated issues and procedures. I am indeed proud to have had the opportunity to serve in Congress with DICK BOLLING, and to have him as a friend. His leaving creates a void in this institution, and in our State delegation, that will not be filled easily. I know I speak for all House Members when I say that I hope he will continue to let us have the benefit of his wisdom, his leadership, and his friendship for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege of coming to Congress at the same time DICK BOLLING came. When I came here with him I knew he was a real leader. In the years I have been here, I think that Speaker Rayburn and DICK BOLLING are probably the two most able legislators that I have served with. I feel he is the strongest man and most able man and most dedicated man to American ideals that we have in the House of Representatives today—a man of great intelligence, a man of great character, honesty and courage are qualities of his life.

Mr. Speaker, I used to practice law years ago and I always thought if I could be a lawyer's lawyer the people would look at me as somebody who really could be a leader among lawyers. I really would have made the top rung in my life. Now that I have come to Congress and been here these years, I look about me and think about the years and the types of people I have served with, and I think there has been one man who has been outstanding as a Congressman's Congressman, and that is DICK BOLLING.

I remember many problems that I tried to tackle here that I did not really tackle just right. DICK, I think, is probably younger than I am, but his counsel and guidance was so good in these things. Particularly I remember I was uptight about trying to accomplish an ethics group, a committee here, and if it had not been for DICK BOLLING we never would have put it together properly. I put together, but it was a hodgepodge compared to what we finally attained. This is one example among many.

I think almost all of the great legislation this Congress has passed since DICK has been here has had his hand on it and it has been already mentioned the fact despite all of these great qualities of character and leadership, at the heart of it is a very great man, a man of compassion, a man of thoughtfulness and kindness for his fellow man. The little man is his concern. The concern of this great country is his concern. It is a great pleasure

to serve with DICK. It must be wonderful to leave an institution when you are at the height of your ability and still have many good years ahead of you. That is a nice time. I think most people outrun their time.

In the case of DICK BOLLING, he goes out like a meteor, of course he is going on to other things which, I am sure, will be rewarding for the country. He is leaving here with not only the great respect of the Congress but the great respect of his country and the love and affection of all Members of Congress.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to thank both of our colleagues from Missouri for taking this time to not only pay tribute to DICK BOLLING but also to say thank you for your service to this House of Representatives.

So many things have already been said that I wish to say and so I hope my colleagues will permit me to maybe be a little bit repetitious, but I think they bear repeating because of the fine way in which DICK BOLLING has served as a major leader in the Congress of the United States.

First of all, I very much respect DICK as a presiding officer of this body, as one who attempts to get attention here and there during the proceedings. He was always extremely fair and made sure that those who were seeking attention did receive it, but also made sure that the House remembered that there was an orderly process by which we should abide. He did not hesitate at any moment to call to our attention when we were violating those rules of the House or stepping aside in an appropriate manner.

□ 1510

I guess the second reason that many of us appreciated his fine service in the House and have appreciated it is because he was so involved in that process, as has already been stated, so totally understood the legislative process and participated in it to such an extent himself that he made it a really living, moving process, which we can all appreciate.

I think many of us are very grateful for the time and effort that DICK BOLLING spent in trying to reorganize this House in a more meaningful way. He spent endless hours trying to guide us to do the things we should do and reducing overlapping jurisdictions among our many committees and trying to get us to pay attention to the business at hand in a way that would be more meaningful and I think we really need to say thank you for the tremendous amount of time that he spent in trying to give us a reorganization plan that would be helpful to the whole process.

I had an opportunity to serve with DICK BOLLING on the Joint Economic Committee. He made sure when he was chairman of that committee or vice chairman, or whatever, that we forced ourselves to listen to all aspects of discussion on economic affairs, brought in every possible authority that he could find to make sure that we were doing our job and that even though the Joint Economic Committee has no legislative responsibility, the responsibilities that do reside to report to the Budget Committee, to report to the House, to give regular reports on what the economic facts of life are, he follows through on that in a very positive and constructive way. I know that he made sure that those of us who were on the committee did our part to also participate.

As has already been stated, the reason that he was so successful is that he has a deep love and respect for the House of Representatives and what it is supposed to mean as the people's body. He made sure that we remember that and when he was presiding over this body, when he had to call us to task for not giving it that due respect, he certainly did so in a very sometimes sharp, but I think, very positive way.

Though it has been stated that he has been a tough minded leader, and that is certainly true, as one who is on the opposite side of the fence on many of the issues with DICK BOLLING I can say he is tough-minded; but also he had a sense of compassion, as has already been stated so well, and he expressed it very well when he was taking the floor on those given issues or participating in the Rules Committee to make sure that adequate rules were given for the several points of view.

So we do have a respect, most of us, I think, if not all of us, for that tremendous capability that he brought to the House, with that love and sense of this House that is so needed and he made sure we, too, respected it.

I guess I have enjoyed knowing DICK BOLLING primarily because he has been a strong leader. I think strong leadership is needed desperately and he always was there to provide it. Whether you agreed with him or not, and I did not many times find myself in agreement politically, as has been stated by many on our side, you knew that he was there, that he would participate as a strong leader and that you better know your facts and case before you came to present it.

I thank the gentleman again for taking this time. I think it is very refreshing to say thank you to somebody before they have departed to another world, so I thank the gentleman for taking this time, both gentlemen.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from California.

I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is no one in this House who appreciates and respects DICK BOLLING more than I do. In 1954 both of us were placed on the Rules Committee and we sat side by side for 18 years. You get to know a man well when you work at his side for 18 years. DICK BOLLING's knowledge and skill is extraordinary.

He is also among the most conscientious Members of this body. I have seen him kind and gentle and I have seen him mean and tough—mean and tough, with a Member of this Congress he thought had ability and who came before the Rules Committee unprepared. DICK BOLLING has always been prepared. His commitment to excellence is tireless; his dedication to his duties is total.

DICK's legislative contributions are almost overwhelming. For example, we were floundering when the Civil Rights Act was before us and here came a son of the South who was the strongest arm in the House in moving that historic legislation.

In my 30 years here, there has not been a reform in this Congress that DICK BOLLING did not conceive.

I remember the 1966 committee; I was on it myself. The ideas all germinated from DICK.

And I wonder where the Nation would have gone if we had not established the Budget Committee about 6 years ago, the brainchild of DICK BOLLING.

Nobody loves this House more than DICK does. He understands its rules. He understands its history, and the sensitivity by which it operates. He is a master in the operation of this Congress. He has the respect of the House every time he takes the floor and he always handles the tough ones. DICK has never stepped back from a tough issue. The tougher they are, the better he likes it.

Knowing DICK as I did through the days when we were writing Johnson's "Great Society" legislation—the sensitivity that he had for America, for education, for the poor and the elderly—he helped construct this legislation and played a significant role in its passage.

We hate to see DICK leave. But it is of his own choice. I do not know how or when or if his shoes will ever be filled here.

As Speaker of the House, DICK, I want to say publicly what a great friend you are, and what a debt of gratitude I owe to you for the strong arm you have been, for your loyalty, for your brilliance—a friend I could always count on. You will be missed, not only by me, DICK, but by anyone and everyone who has known you along life's line.

May God's blessing be with you, DICK. You are a great guy.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DERRICK).

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for recognizing me and I thank the gentleman for taking these special orders this afternoon.

You know, I have been sitting here a little bit in a daze, I guess, because although I knew that DICK was going to retire, I really had not allowed myself to think about it too much, because it is hard for me to picture this House of Representatives without DICK BOLLING.

There is no question about it, I am asked from time to time, who is the greatest mind in the House? It takes me about 2 seconds to say, "DICK BOLLING."

I remember one time having a discussion with my son. He was concerned about something that had happened at school that he had done, and he felt that his popularity had been threatened. I remember telling him, "Well, son, you probably have two routes to take. One, you will be respected, and the other, you will be popular; not necessarily do they run in a parallel pair."

□ 1520

Well, DICK BOLLING today stands as the most respected man in the House. You know, I have seen him when he did not care about his popularity and I doubt that he does right now. But in spite of it, he has ended up as probably the most popular man in the House as well.

I guess probably a lot of folks found out what I found out about him: that his bite is significant, but his bark is a little louder. He is a legislator's legislator.

I look in that corner. I do not know how many offices he has in this institution, but I know where his busiest office is. It is right over there against the wall, or in one of those seats to my left. I know times that I have had to get fifth and sixth in line and move down like musical chairs so I could have a conference with him.

One of the proudest things I ever had said to me was by a man who got mad with me and did not particularly like my chairman and referred to him as my mentor in this House, and I plead guilty to that. It has been a wonderful experience.

You know, there is no telling how many Members are still in this House today who would not be here because of DICK BOLLING. I know I am not alone, because I discussed it with other Members over the years. Those who are thinking about leaving Congress, those who are thinking about running for the lower body, those who are thinking about running for offices

back home, and they look at DICK BOLLING and they say, "You know, if he stayed here for this many years, and he was able to shake this institution, maybe I can make a contribution as well," and have stayed on.

I would not be on the Rules Committee today if it were not for DICK. He encouraged me, he helped me, he trusted me, and he asked others to trust me who did not know me as well, and that is why I am proud to be on the Rules Committee—the first member to serve on the Rules Committee from the State of South Carolina since 1932. I do not know, but I hope the Rules Committee is as important as I tell my constituents it is, and I think it is. I hope it will retain its importance when DICK leaves.

As has been said before, and as I have talked with him over the last several years, there are very few things that can be mentioned, major accomplishments—and some of them not accomplishments—that DICK BOLLING did not have a part in, so I will not be repetitious. I will just say, you know, DICK, I am going to miss you; God, I am going to miss you. But as you leave, I want you to know that I have always thought of you as a man's man. You know, I have always thought of you as a character out of Hemingway, or maybe Hemingway himself—a man with a great mind, a man that loves the out of doors, loves his fellowman, but has respect for him. And certainly a man who does not suffer fools lightly.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and very much appreciate his taking this time to pay tribute to someone who has served this institution so very well.

I, in particular, had not yet been born when DICK BOLLING came to this institution. At this point I am still just midway through my freshman term in the Congress. But ever since I was a student of political science, DICK BOLLING was my model of what an effective Member of this body exemplified.

DICK BOLLING really cares about people, and he understands the processes that need to be used to follow through.

I think I would just have one request for DICK BOLLING, and really think I speak on behalf of a number of the younger Members, and that, DICK, is that we just hope you will remain as accessible to us as you have been this year. The chance to have your counsel and your advice in the years ahead is something that will be of great help to me, and I think many of the other younger Members. We are still looking

forward to working with him in the years ahead.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DYSON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I was born the year that DICK BOLLING came to the Congress, and about 27 years after that I had a dream. I had a dream of coming to the Congress, and in 1976 I ran for the U.S. Congress from the State of Maryland. I had a fund raiser in a little place called Great Mills, in St. Mary's County, Md., and I was so bold as to write a letter to a U.S. Congressman by the name of DICK BOLLING to ask him to come and to be the guest speaker at this fund raiser. A few weeks later I received a letter, indicating he would come. And he did come and he made a tremendous impression. I realized it was a difficult thing to go into an area where nobody knows you and make a speech everyone enjoys and everyone likes. But he did it. He came with his lovely wife James Grant Bolling, and they both made a tremendous impression.

When he left, he left me with a dream, a dream of some day being able to come to the Congress—I thought it would be 1976, but I had to wait—for the day to be able to sit in the U.S. Congress and call DICK BOLLING my colleague. I have realized that dream, and it has been an honor to be associated with him. I am sorry to see him go.

No tribute to Representative BOLLING would be complete however, without mention of his wife Jim Grant Bolling who passed away in 1979. Her own accomplishments were commendable by themselves. She created the Congressional Relations Office at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Kennedy administration and helped form the Congressional Club here on the Hill. But the strength of this extraordinary woman to her husband stemmed from the fact that she stood by his side in good times and bad, helped in his office and was his confidant and best friend.

Mr. Speaker, it has not only been a pleasure to know Congressman RICHARD BOLLING in the House of Representatives, but also to have worked with and learned from him. The people of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District are losing a fine and dedicated public servant and Congress is losing a distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I want DICK BOLLING to know that his colleagues not only tip their hats to his service to this Nation—but we tip our hearts to him as well for his friendship and his leadership.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Missouri for taking this time to pay tribute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

I remember DICK BOLLING when I was first elected to Congress over 23 years ago. I came to Washington for the first time in my life in December, prior to being sworn in, and I met DICK BOLLING, and our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Thompson, and I remember how impressed I was then with his knowledge, his legislative wisdom, and his political good sense. Over all these years, my admiration for him has not changed.

Often we have occasion to salute a retiring Member, but I think this is a unique occasion, because I do not think to anyone in our time are we so indebted for having contributed so much to the institution of the House of Representatives, not only in the reform sense, in the sense of changing the institution to conform to the post-war days of World War II, to modern times, but for infusing a sense of responsibility, a sense of integrity in this institution, and it has been under attack. So quite apart from calling him a friend and enjoying his presence, sharing in his wisdom, we will miss one of the people who has had the greatest impact on the House of Representatives in modern times, and has steadfastly tried, I think wisely so, to cause this institution to be more responsive to people's needs.

So we will miss him as he goes, we will miss him as a friend, as someone who counsels us from time to time, both in terms of his party's policies and legislation and also in terms of what we ought to look like as an institution in 1982 and the years ahead.

□ 1530

So, I am pleased to join with the gentleman in saluting my friend, DICK BOLLING.

Mr. SKELTON. I do appreciate the gentleman's words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to be able to participate in this special order and commend the Missouri delegation with this opportunity to honor one of its most able and distinguished Members, DICK BOLLING.

During two terms as chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Missouri has had an opportunity to play a key leadership role, one which he had actually performed without portfolio for a generation. He has served as the most effective advo-

cate of the concept of party government in the House, demanding of his party that it always have a program and use every tool at its disposal to deliver that program. But this demand has never taken the form of obstruction and he has served four Republican Presidents as loyally as the four Democrats who have been President during his public life.

He has been an effective and loyal "right arm" to every Speaker since Sam Rayburn. But he has never subverted his own independence and conscience to that loyalty. During the service of John McCormack, the gentleman was the most formidable force in the House in calling its leadership to account. But, to the day Speaker McCormack died, neither of them ever lost the personal respect in which they held each other. Indeed, at the time of the late Speaker's death, the gentleman from Missouri made an extraordinarily fine tribute which I take the liberty of borrowing to apply to the gentleman, himself:

He is probably the best Democrat I ever saw. He was one of the greatest fighters of all time. I will never forget him as long as I live as one of the people who taught me not only to love this House, but to love working on behalf of the people that he worked for and that I hope all of us work for, and those are the people of this country who cannot have the strength themselves and need the compassion and the help of those that love them.

It is sad that DICK BOLLING is leaving the House at the time when this ideal to which he has called it, is so dangerously threatened by those who would rule this land by ledgers rather than vision. Battles are ahead in this Congress in which our party will need its greatest fighter. But battles will continue in future Congresses in which we will equally need his vision and his advice. I know, even in retirement, that he will continue his fight from other forums with the same energy, intellect, and compassion he brought to this Chamber for so many years.

I will always be grateful to fate that I have had the honor of serving on the Rules Committee during his chairmanship. The lessons I have learned will serve me well throughout my career. As chairman, he has been a strong conscience, a tireless leader, but most of all, a good friend.

Every Member tries to represent his constituents and to remain in close touch with their concerns, but we need to be reminded that our district has sent us to a national assembly which must address the needs of a great country. The fair balancing of local and national concerns is no easy matter but no one has served as a better model to us all than DICK BOLLING.

I can recall no issue or real importance during the brief time I have served in this House, in which the gentleman has not been at the forefront

of the fight. Some of those fights have been won and some have not, but what all of us will remember is that each was fought well, each was fought fairly, and both the defeats and the victories have been accepted with honor, with dignity, and with grace.

I thank my friend from Missouri for taking this special order and giving me an opportunity to participate. It is difficult for me to say goodbye to DICK BOLLING. It is even more difficult to say it well. But with all sincerity, I wish the gentleman well and assure him of my loyalty and my friendship in all the years ahead.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER).

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to thank the gentleman in the well and my other colleague from Missouri, Congressman GEPHARDT, for taking this time to pay tribute to a person who has been described as perhaps having been very important in reform, and having had more effect on the structure of this body than any other person in modern history. I, too, agree with that.

I, too, wish to pay tribute to the gentleman, a colleague of mine from Missouri. Even though I feel that we have had others from Missouri, from my district especially, who have served in this House so well in the past, such as Champ Clark, such as Clarence Cannon, I put DICK BOLLING right along there with them. I am quite proud to be able to stand here today and feel that I have served with a gentleman of his stature even though at times we have disagreed on issues, and there are times that we have agreed on many others, but I think very firmly that he and I agree very strongly that in the institution it is the foremost issue, and that it is the institution which he has worked so well in fostering and providing the procedural changes that are needed and have been needed. He has had an effect on the structure of this institution that is necessary for the institution to prevail, and he has helped to bring this institution to where it is today.

I agree with those who have said that he has had more effect than any other person in modern history on this institution, and I want to congratulate him. I look forward to working 1 more year with him in this institution, and, I hope, working with him thereafter for many more years.

Thank you very much for being here, DICK.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.).

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard about this special order, and I came over from my office to say just one or two things. I have only been in this body for a relatively short period of time compared to the great service that has been the whole life of DICK BOLLING in the Congress of the United States. I have never missed an opportunity to listen to this great legislator when he stood where I am standing now or in the well of this House, because what he said was worth listening to.

I know on many occasions that my vote and his vote have not been the same, but my respect and admiration for DICK BOLLING is without parallel in this House. His wisdom and his perseverance at times will be missed, sorely missed. I hope that in the coming years that he continues to enjoy the best of health, that he will continue to visit with us from time to time. I realize that he has another year, but I would have been remiss had I not been here today to pay my deep respects to this outstanding legislator and gentleman. I know of nothing more than one can say when one refers to him as the gentleman that I know he is, and the high regard and respect that he is held in by every Member of this body.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his participation in the special order today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my many colleagues in honoring one of the great congressional leaders of this century, DICK BOLLING of Missouri.

When DICK BOLLING announced his retirement, he explained that he felt he would be "more useful to the causes he believes in out, than in." If that is in fact true, then despite our sense of loss over the departure of an esteemed colleague, we all must be heartened over the prospects of his work on the outside.

For the causes of DICK BOLLING are the best causes any of us can believe in. Since coming to Congress in 1948, he has been the premier champion of institutional reform in the Congress, leading the struggle to overturn the strict seniority system that strangled the institution for so long, and bringing democracy to the House. His work in trying to reform the House and its

committee system in the 1970's and his two outstanding books on the workings of the House show his exceptional mastery of the legislative process.

In addition to the institutional reforms, he also played a major role in many of the great policy issues of our times. His understanding of legislative strategy and the House rules was key to the passage of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, and led to adoption of the congressional budget process in 1974.

But it is more than his parliamentary wizardry, political acumen, intellectual brilliance, and his articulate and constructive criticism of the institution in which he has served the people of Missouri's Fifth District for 34 years that has distinguished his career.

What will be missed most when DICK BOLLING retires is his integrity. He did not preach integrity, he personified it. I am reminded of an address by Edmund Burke, a Member of Parliament speaking to his constituents at Bristol in 1774, a speech often quoted by DICK BOLLING to his own constituents.

Burke's words defines a legislator's responsibility as well as the courage, wisdom, and political judgment that he or she must exercise. In my mind, Burke's remarks typify DICK BOLLING's philosophy of the role of the legislator, and the kind of integrity which has been his trademark in Congress.

Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in strictest union, the closest correspondence and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. . . . But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. . . . Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

Fortunately, even after he retires, the example of DICK BOLLING will remain for us all.

You have probably guessed by now how highly I think of DICK BOLLING. I came quickly to learn just what an extraordinarily fine human being he is while serving with him on the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee. I have great admiration for him and value his counsel, his friendship, and his wisdom.

Most of what I have said so far about DICK BOLLING is, I expect, rather similar to what many of my colleagues will say today in honoring one of the most respected Members of this body. I have one other comment, however, that very few other Members are likely to make.

For all the deep respect and admiration many Members feel toward DICK BOLLING, he has earned a reputation for not going out of his way to win popularity contests. As he himself

once put it, "I have never been too good at buttering up my colleagues."

That may be the case. But in one area, DICK BOLLING has far exceeded most other Members in his treatment of his colleagues, and has particularly earned this Member's respect and gratitude. "Sensitive" is not a word too many of our colleagues would use in describing DICK BOLLING. But he, in fact, possesses a degree of sensitivity toward human beings unlike that of any political figure I have known. I have never known him to say an unkind word about any individual. He treats Members, staff, constituents, and men and women in all walks of life with consideration and equality. Above all he is honest—the most intellectually honest person I have known.

DICK BOLLING possesses those rare qualities of integrity, honesty, grace, and class—qualities seldom found today in any walk of life. ●

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor to rise today to join my colleagues in saluting DICK BOLLING, who without question has been one of the most outstanding Members to ever serve in this august body.

During his nearly 32 years of service in the House, DICK BOLLING has compiled an enviable record as both a leader and a lawmaker.

Perhaps no other Member in recent times has had so great an influence on the actual day to day operations of the House of Representatives as has DICK BOLLING. He was the brilliant master planner whose reform proposals made the House a more effective body in dealing with the highly complex problems facing our Nation.

Of major importance was his redesigning of the Federal budget process which ended the old system in which spending bills were routinely passed one by one without concern for their effect on the overall economy.

DICK BOLLING's self-proclaimed long-term love affair with the House of Representatives will never be forgotten. A highly prolific writer, he has written several books dealing with the House that serve as standard reference materials for any student of politics.

As chairman of the House Rules Committee, Congressman BOLLING has added a new dimension of efficient leadership to that position resulting in assured quick and thorough consideration of the bills presented to that highly important panel.

DICK BOLLING will also be long remembered in this House and by the people of our Nation for his efforts in securing passage of legislation to better the lives of all segments of our society.

As a member of the Rules Committee, he played a key role in helping obtain passage of the 1964 civil rights bill and vital labor legislation that bet-

tered the lives of millions of American workers.

The people of Kansas City are losing a great Representative in DICK BOLLING. His decision to retire at the end of this session of Congress is also a loss to all Americans. A man with the abilities and insight of DICK BOLLING will sorely be missed as this House attempts to deal with the current economic and social turmoil in the Nation.

While he may be retiring from the House, one thing is certain; we have not heard the last from DICK BOLLING.

DICK, I am proud to have known and worked with you.●

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Representative DICK BOLLING after an extraordinary record of service in the U.S. Congress expanding 30 years is both a time for profound sorrow and great exultation.

Sorrow—in that the Congress loses a courageous statesman extraordinaire.

Exultation—in view of the remarkable contribution of service not only to his beloved State of Missouri but to the entire Nation.

The U.S. House of Representatives will not be the same without our highly esteemed DICK BOLLING. It is significant that Mr. BOLLING in his collective service to Missouri and the Nation represented the essence of a caring, compassionate, scholarly, and politically effective statesman. His refreshing civility, ability to unravel parliamentary thickets, and his fierce commitment to improving the body politic made him a highly respected Member of this body.

We shall never forget his wit, strong commitment to civil and human rights, deep belief in human possibilities for all of our citizens, and a desire to extend and enrich the ideals of our Nation which made his presence here one that made a difference.

It is difficult for many from the perspective of the 1980's to understand the dichotomy that existed in our Nation in the 1950's and 1960's when black and nonwhite Americans were even more distant from the mainstream of American life. This dichotomy even had the blessing of our Nation as reflected in the law at the time and the support of many Members of the Congress who were unwilling to break with ancient traditions. DICK BOLLING as a member of the House Rules Committee often fought a lonely battle in working to move civil rights and civil liberties legislation forward at a time when such legislation and those who advocated it were unpopular. However, he never wavered in his commitment and in time was able to move vital civil rights and civil liberties legislation forward as well as become chairman of the House Rules Committee.

As a fellow Congressman from Missouri, I shall miss the profound com-

mitment that this master of the rules of the House evidenced in the Congress. Not only was he admired for his knowledge of the institution, but also for his appreciation and respect for the highest traditions of the institution. His career can indeed be categorized as a profile in courage, profound sensitivity, and a rigorous application of prodigious intellect.

I shall miss his resolute belief in the power of the rule of law and his determination to develop a just and caring society. The retirement of RICHARD BOLLING, a master of parliamentary strategy signifies the end of an era but his legacy will become a part of the institution and traditions he so greatly respected and indeed personified, and will make an indelible impression for all Congressmen who follow in his footsteps.

I wish this exemplary statesman Godspeed, good health, and personal fulfillment as he undertakes other interests of his choosing.

A DICK BOLLING does not retire, he simply commences to start anew in other undertakings.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is both an honor and a sad duty to participate in this special order to pay tribute to our esteemed and beloved friend and colleague DICK BOLLING. It is an honor simply because all of us who have served with and know DICK BOLLING do consider it an honor. It is a sad duty because we will be saying farewell to DICK after this session of Congress adjourns.

Since 1948, the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri have been provided with the highest quality representation by DICK BOLLING. His attention to constituent needs is unparalleled and has served as an exemplary example for all who have followed him into the House.

History will treat DICK BOLLING with respect and reverence. He has served with particular distinction as chairman of the House Rules Committee—one of the most prestigious and important of all positions in Congress. He has presided over the committee during some of the most tumultuous days in the history of the House. DICK has always wielded his considerable power with equity—the Rules Committee has been accessible to each and every Member of this House.

In many ways DICK serves as one of the consciences of the House. His knowledge about the inner workings of this institution is without peer. His authority in turn is derived from both his knowledge and experience. He is a professor of House processes and many of us can call ourselves his students.

DICK's two books, "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House" are testaments to the genius of DICK BOLLING.

It seems hard to fully put into words the appreciation which we his colleagues feel for DICK BOLLING. I have a deep and abiding respect for DICK. While it is said that no one is indispensable, the departure of DICK BOLLING will leave the House a lesser place.

Perhaps our best tribute to him would be to try and emulate him in our daily activities as Members. I wish him a peaceful and prosperous alternative career and hope he will stay close to Washington for his counsel will always be in the highest demand.●

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to one of the great Members in the history of the House of Representatives, our colleague RICHARD BOLLING of Missouri.

RICHARD BOLLING has devoted 34 years to public service in the Congress. Few Members have a record which can equal his. His major achievements were in helping modernize the processes of the House, drafting the Budget Act of 1974 and pushing through the landmark civil rights legislation of the 1950's and 1960's from his key post on the Rules Committee. His presence in the Congress contributed to a better life for millions of Americans.

In addition to his activities as a Member of Congress, RICHARD BOLLING has a well-deserved reputation as a distinguished author and interpreter of this institution. His books, "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House," are must reading for any student of the Congress. No doubt, now that he has more free time, other important contributions to the literature on Congress will be forthcoming. Perhaps more than any other Member, RICHARD BOLLING has shaped perceptions of the internal workings of Congress in the media, in academia and among the public generally, and he will continue to do so.

RICHARD BOLLING has built a reputation as someone who knows how to use power wisely. He has been a member of the Rules Committee for most of his tenure in the House, and chairman for the last 4 years. Before assuming the chairmanship himself in 1979, he was the de facto leader of the committee's majority, the eyes and ears of the leadership, the man who could solve problems and provide guidance at crucial points in the legislative process.

Often overlooked because of Congressman BOLLING's vital role on the Rules Committee is his other committee assignment on the Joint Economic Committee. He also had the opportunity to serve briefly there as chairman before assuming leadership of Rules. RICHARD BOLLING has always been interested in the substance of economic policy as well as the congressional process for enacting it, and focused the joint committee on conducting significant studies of the economy during his chairmanship.

Another important part of DICK BOLLING's career here was his role as a presiding officer in the House and the Committee of the Whole on controversial matters. His thorough knowledge of the rules and ability to maintain order were important in the expeditious consideration of many pieces of major legislation.

When I took office last June and wanted to learn how the House of Representatives worked from the inside, I went to see DICK BOLLING and to observe the Rules Committee in action. I got a good education, and I shall always be grateful to the chairman for taking the time to explain the process and offer advice based on his rich experience here.

With the retirement of RICHARD BOLLING, the House has lost an original. There is really no one, on either side of the aisle, who can ever play quite the role he has.

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, our brilliant colleague and the very best friend a man could have, DICK BOLLING, has announced that he will retire from Congress after 34 years of distinguished service.

As deeply as we revere DICK BOLLING as a friend, we also respect him as a leader in this House. Dick has always given unselfishly of his time, counsel, and vast experience to his colleagues. He is a consummate strategist who possesses a complete mastery of parliamentary procedures.

With his remarkable intellect and encyclopedic knowledge of congressional operations Dick has led the way to countless reforms. I am sure that most of our colleagues have devoured Dick's excellent books on how Congress works and how it should work. These books epitomize DICK BOLLING's knack for incisive analysis and thoughtful recommendations.

DICK BOLLING cares about Congress and the millions of people we represent. Throughout his exceptional career in public service, his intellectual gifts and parliamentary skills have been focused on making the Government more responsive and effective. Among his many outstanding achievements is designing the Federal budget process and devising a plan for reorganization of the Federal Government.

We will sorely miss Dick when he retires at the end of the year, but his influence on this House and our Nation will long be felt. We will miss his wit, his understanding and his wise counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself fortunate to serve with DICK BOLLING and to know he is my friend.

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I regard DICK BOLLING as one of the outstanding Members of Congress whom I have had the pleasure of meeting and working with since 1971. He unquestionably knows more of the operation of the Congress than any Member we now

have. One of his great characteristics has been his willingness to listen to and to help new Members as they launch their careers in the House. It is a great loss to all of us to have Dick leave. I will personally miss him as a friend and an advisor, who has helped me so many times over the years.

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to have the opportunity to honor our distinguished colleague, DICK BOLLING, who will be retiring at the end of this session of Congress. Thirty-four years of dedicated excellence is this brilliant public servant's record: Excellence in service to his State, to his country and, perhaps most of all, to this institution, the U.S. House of Representatives. No more profound thinker or more capable parliamentarian has ever occupied the chairmanship of the Committee on Rules, on which it has been my privilege to serve with him. Dick's retirement will be an inestimable loss to the committee and to this body, both of which he has served with the deepest dedication.

It is fitting that the day we pay tribute to RICHARD BOLLING is also the day that we paid tribute in a joint session of Congress to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. What one man began—blazing a new trail as to the proper role of Government and in so doing extending the warm and willing helping hand of Government to those in need of assistance—the other man has continued. The contributions made by DICK BOLLING, legislatively, procedurally, and as a humanitarian and author, will be an enduring testimonial to the eminence of the man and an example for all of us, and to those who will occupy our places in this body in the future, to emulate.

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in this tribute to my friend DICK BOLLING. Dick's inspired leadership helped bring about changes in the seniority system in House voting procedures, in the congressional budget process—all aimed at making this body more responsible and accountable to the citizens.

Through his skills as a master parliamentarian, and his chairmanship of the Rules Committee, Dick has served as a major House strategist for progressive legislation. He has played an invaluable role in assembling the coalitions that have passed the major domestic programs of this generation, including our landmark civil rights legislation. As a member and former chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, he shares my concern with the need for America's economic renewal.

More than for his considerable legislative achievements, however, Dick will be remembered for his concern for the House as an institution. As father to the House reform movement, he has left his mark on younger colleagues, and on the structure and pro-

cedures of the House. In this way, Dick's contributions to this body will transcend his long and productive term in office.

He carries with him into retirement our gratitude for his statesmanship, our appreciation for his friendship, and our best wishes for a long and happy postcongressional career.

● Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing my tremendous respect and admiration for a distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING of Missouri.

DICK BOLLING is leaving the House at the end of this session, but his service here will be long remembered. I have served with Dick on the Committee on Rules since 1965, and it has been a true pleasure.

Dick is a brilliant man, whose intellect and political skill will remain a benchmark for those who follow him to this body. His dedication has made him an outstanding Representative for his people, and his leadership has had a significant impact on this House. The fundamental operations of this Congress have been markedly changed due to reforms he authored and standards he has set.

Dick is a persuasive spokesman for his party's views on national issues. We may have been adversaries from time to time, as controversial issues moved through this institution, but we never have been enemies. DICK BOLLING is a formidable opponent, but one who always conducts himself with gentlemanly courtesy and fairness.

My admiration for Dick have increased with each year we have served together. I have no doubt that his voice will remain in our consciences long after the 97th Congress brings his career among us to an end.

DICK BOLLING's presence here will be missed, but his contributions to this Congress will remain with us for years to come.

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my distinguished chairman, RICHARD BOLLING. When he leaves the Congress at the end of this session, this country will lose an able and effective Representative of the people, and this House will lose a man of honor, integrity, and intelligence. I will miss his steady hand, his level head, and his unparalleled devotion to this institution that is this House.

When I first entered Congress in 1979, I was given an awesome responsibility. I became only the second Democratic freshman Member in this century to be appointed to the Rules Committee, and it was RICHARD BOLLING who became my tutor in the legislative process and who selflessly imparted his wisdom gained through his long and devoted service to his constituents, his country, and to the House of Representatives. I am indeed fortu-

nate to have had this man as my chairman and my teacher.

However, DICK BOLLING has not left us yet. The coming months will be difficult ones for this body and I for one am gratified that he will be here to assist us as we grapple with the enormous problems facing our Nation. His compassion and devotion to democratic principles will serve this country well in 1982 and his legacy will serve as a guidepost for those of us who will serve in future Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, just saying "thank you" does not seem adequate. You are a great American and I am proud to have served with you and prouder still to call you my friend.●

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in this tribute to the distinguished congressional career of RICHARD BOLLING. For the last 3 years I have had the very special privilege of being a member of the Rules Committee and had the benefit of serving under its chairman, DICK BOLLING. This has been a rare and special privilege indeed, since I have met no one during my tenure in the House of Representatives more knowledgeable or more protective of the precedents and procedures of this great institution. Dick has demonstrated time and time again the importance of, and power wielded by a thorough understanding, appreciation, and utilization of the rules that govern this august body. He has not used this knowledge and subsequent power frivolously, or to further his own personal position but has displayed his prowess in the name of justness and equitability.

Dick's desire to better the inner workings of the House and to improve the efficiency of the legislative process has been well documented through his legislative career. His place in the history of the House of Representatives is secure. Years from now historians and political scholars alike would be remiss in their writings if they neglected to mention the contributions and insights provided by DICK BOLLING.

All the members of the Rules Committee who have served with him, as well as the Members who have testified before him, can verify that DICK BOLLING's desire for fairness, equity, and evenhandedness is without question and beyond reproach. All of us have committed the Golden Rule to memory, but not everyone makes such a commitment to his life and his work. DICK BOLLING has made this commitment.

The void left by his retirement will not be filled easily, if at all. During my years on the Rules Committee, DICK BOLLING has been both a knowledgeable teacher and valued friend. I feel certain of his continued success in future endeavors, but his friendship and leadership in the House of Representatives will be sorely missed.●

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, DICK BOLLING has been called the intellectual father of the reform movement and a master strategist. These two descriptions accurately reflect the outstanding qualities and contributions of the dean of the Missouri delegation. I am honored to join in the tribute to a close and well-deserving friend.

DICK BOLLING and I have served together in the House of Representatives for over 27 years. In that time, through four Speaker, of the House and seven Presidents, Dick stands out as a tower of integrity and a beacon of brilliance. No one I have served with has been better equipped intellectually to meet and master the complexities of congressional action and politics. His unique combination of integrity and knowledge makes him a formidable foe and a valued ally.

My first year in the House was Dick's first year on the House Rules Committee. He was, of course, eventually to become its chairman and to become a principal draftsman in the reforms to make the House a more responsive institution. A believer in a strong Speaker and an active majority caucus, Dick was an important mainstay on the Rules Committee who facilitated the passage of landmark civil rights legislation.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee for 24 years, his interest in economics long predates this latest period when it has become fashionable to speak about deficits, inflation, and a balanced budget. In an effort to impose accountability on an old system where spending bills were passed without regard to their cumulative effect, Dick played a leading role in designing the new Federal budget process.

While it will not be unusual for history to show that RICHARD BOLLING came into office in 1948 as a reformer, it will indeed be unique to record that his fire for reform has not died over 33 years. I know that I, along with our colleagues, will miss his wisdom, his inspiring insight, and his personal warmth.●

● Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to join in paying tribute to my friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, DICK BOLLING. We are all saddened to learn of Dick's plans of retirement for he will be missed.

It has been my good fortune to serve with DICK BOLLING for the duration of his congressional career. Dick's contributions to this body are innumerable and his knowledge of the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives is second to none. We in the Appropriations Committee have leaned heavily on DICK BOLLING's expertise in bringing our bills to the House when circumstances have made necessary.

One of Dick's outstanding achievements was his key role in the creation

of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and, perhaps more importantly, as chairman of the Rules Committee he helped us live with the Budget Act after its key protective provisions were set aside. The Budget Act was designed to make Congress more able to determine sound fiscal policy and establish national spending priorities.

The work of DICK BOLLING has been exceptional. We will all miss DICK BOLLING and his work here, and wish him well in all future endeavors.●

● Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to participate in this special order honoring the outstanding congressional career of a man who has dedicated more than three decades of his life to distinguished public service—RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri.

When I first came to Congress in 1967, it was DICK BOLLING who taught me one of the simplest, yet most essential, of lessons: How to get votes in the absence of a quorum. There were two steps, he said. First, object to the vote on the basis that a quorum was not present. Second, make a point of order that a quorum was not present.

Even many veteran legislators still stumble over that modest procedure. In my own case, because of that 1 minute of this scholarly man's time, the rule has been fixed and simple for me.

Dick's mastery of the most minute detail of the legislative process is legendary, and his splendid service as chairman of the House Rules Committee will remain a legacy of exemplary leadership.

DICK BOLLING is not only a gifted teacher, but a lasting friend. I shall miss his wise counsel and welcomed presence in these Halls.●

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in this tribute to Congressman RICHARD BOLLING, who has announced that he will retire at the end of this year. Mr. BOLLING has served in the House for over 32 years, and he currently continues in the very formidable task as chair of the House Rules Committee.

Congressman BOLLING has stood in this very Chamber for many long hours to defend those principles and practices in which he and his constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri believe. Yet, his work was not limited only to his district. Chairman BOLLING did not hesitate to serve strongly as a House Democratic leader, to address many issues which dealt with the need for fairness and equity for all citizens throughout this Nation.

Chairman BOLLING is noted with respect for his arduous work in the area of congressional reform. His dedication and knowledge in this area were shared with many in his numerous articles and two books on the subject. Fi-

nally, Congressman BOLLING was chairman of the Select Committee on Committees (1973-74) which produced a blueprint for revising and modernizing House committee structure and procedures.

Chairman BOLLING is a respected member of the Joint Economic Committee. He has coauthored a book, "America's Competitive Edge," which addresses the renewal of America's economic strength. Such work once again demonstrates Mr. BOLLING's willingness to expand his work beyond the Halls of the Congress.

It must also be noted that Dick BOLLING played a leading role in the civil rights battles of the 1950's and 1960's. He is among those responsible for the enactment of critical legislation, during those years, which embodied many of the social changes of the Johnson and Kennedy administrations.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have served with Chairman BOLLING in this House. However, I do know that he will now have even more of a chance to share himself with many others, through his writing and other work. I wish him the very best.●

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to be able to honor DICK BOLLING, a close personal friend of mine, as he begins the last year of his remarkable congressional career.

As a Member of this body for the past 33 years and as chairman of the prestigious Rules Committee, DICK BOLLING has provided the House of Representatives, his constituents, and the United States with distinguished service. His hard work and relentless effort helped implement many meaningful programs that have improved the quality of life for all Americans. Dick can look back on his career with a strong sense of accomplishment and a deep feeling of satisfaction. It has been a job well done.

I have the deepest respect for my colleague from Missouri and I know from listening to others that my feeling is shared. I will miss having DICK BOLLING as a colleague.

He not only contributed to this Chamber as an active Member, but his constructive critiques and progressive ideas from books he authored have provided a framework for many of the positive changes in the way Congress conducts its business. He has shown that one man with good ideas and strong convictions can make a difference. I wish him a long and happy retirement. God bless you, Dick. We will miss you.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, chairman of the House Rules Committee, who is retiring at the close of the 97th Congress as the dean of the Missouri congressional delegation to Congress. It has been a truly rewarding personal experience for me to

have known him as a colleague and I am honored to have served with him during the 17 years I have been in the House of Representatives.

Dick was first elected to the 81st Congress in 1948, and was reelected to every succeeding Congress until the present 97th Congress. He proved himself a capable legislator and fully worthy of the trust and confidence of his constituents of the Fifth Missouri Congressional District. He is a dedicated and devoted American, and a Congressman of outstanding ability, deep compassion, and courage.

Congressman BOLLING's diligent efforts as chairman of the House Rules Committee have been both fruitful and beneficial to the citizens of this Nation, and these successful efforts have made America a more prosperous and productive country. He authored two books on the House of Representatives, entitled "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House," which underscore his depth of human understanding and understanding for the elements which give life and spirit to our system of government.

DICK BOLLING's inspiring example will be missed here in the House, because seldom does one find a man of his stature, a man so wholeheartedly dedicated and responsive to the needs of the people he served. I extend my warmest best wishes to DICK for a healthy and happy retirement.●

● Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure, honor, and a sense of history that I pay tribute to a most influential Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman DICK BOLLING, who—after decades of service here—is going to change careers next January.

When I was appointed as a congressional page in 1953, Chairman BOLLING had already served here in the House for 4 years. Never would I have imagined then that I would have the opportunity to serve as his colleague almost 30 years later as a Member of the Missouri delegation.

Chairman BOLLING has probably had as much if not more influence in the House than any Member of his generation, assembling coalitions to pass major domestic programs and serving as intellectual father to the reform movement that has changed this institution considerably in recent years. Frankly, he and I are not of politically or ideologically kindred spirits, but that in no way diminishes my respect for his leadership or his political or legislative accomplishments, and he has had many. We are probably of kindred spirits on matters procedural, in his efforts to make this enduring body functional and responsive in and to our day and age. This work is not finished, Chairman BOLLING, as I am sure you are keenly aware. When you leave this body, I hope it will give you satisfaction to know that there are those

of us on both sides of the aisle, even in the junior ranks, who intend to continue to work to reform the methods, the procedures, the rules of this body to insure fair treatment for all; to permit the majority will to be worked while preserving the rights of the minority; and, most importantly, to insure that this body in its relation to the people it represents functions as efficaciously as the term "greatest legislative and deliberative body in the world" suggests it should.

As chairman of the House Rules Committee, Chairman BOLLING has been fair and evenhanded. He has had to make some difficult decisions, but he has never used his power as chairman to block legislation he did not support.

Chairman BOLLING has paved the way for the less senior members to more actively participate in the legislative process. For this, we owe Chairman BOLLING a great debt of gratitude.

I am sure that Chairman BOLLING will be successful in all of his future endeavors, and I want to wish him happiness, good health, and good luck in what will be his new role as a private citizen come next January.

The impact Chairman BOLLING has made in and on this body will long be remembered.●

● Mr. BAILEY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join a number of my colleagues in paying tribute to RICHARD BOLLING as he begins this, his last year of a long and distinguished career in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Throughout his many years of dedicated service, this man has been a pillar of the House and has served as an excellent example of leadership and dedication to the people he was elected to serve. His two books are basic guides to anyone who wants to understand the House and how it works.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the thousands of people in congratulating Mr. BOLLING on such an illustrious career and in expressing gratitude for his endless sense of service, his selfless contributions, and his undying commitment to the people he has served for so long and so well.●

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who came to the House with RICHARD BOLLING in 1949, I feel qualified and compelled to say a few words about this remarkable man and his contributions to this body.

Let me begin by saying that I subscribe fully to the idea that DICK BOLLING is a legislative genius. That genius was apparent even in his very early years here and to me, his remarkably wise and often seemingly intuitive perceptions of the legislative and political process were and are simply amazing. But there have been a fair number of very intelligent Members of this House and in my view, it is

the character and basic humanity of RICHARD BOLLING that make him one of the very few truly great Congressmen of the 20th century.

We are losing a man who loves the House, its rules, its mores, its character and I think perhaps even its weaknesses. I will miss him. We owe him much and all of us who have served with RICHARD BOLLING can say we know one really great man in Washington.●

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the tribute to our esteemed colleague and chairman of the Rules Committee RICHARD BOLLING. During his 33 years of service to the people of the Fifth District of Missouri and the Congress, RICHARD BOLLING has been an effective and dedicated public servant.

Over the years of his service, DICK BOLLING has been recognized for his tremendous intellectual capacity. He has been a master of the rules of the House as well as a keen observer of the functionings of Congress as an institution. Many of the great procedural reforms of the House have come as a direct result of his efforts.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Committees, he led an in-depth study of the committee system and rules of the House. As a direct result of his work, many of the reforms of the midseventies were adopted. It is because of his work and dedication that many of our committees now work with a subcommittee structure. We all have to thank him for his efforts to democratize this institution and insure that power is not concentrated, but rather shared.

His skill as a parliamentarian, both as chairman of the Rules Committee and on the floor of the House has been witnessed by all of us. But probably the greatest tribute to his grasp of the parliamentary system under which we work is the repeated faith the leadership has put in him by placing him in the chair during key legislative debates. Not only has he demonstrated his understanding of the procedures of the House while sitting in the chair, but his commanding presence has served to maintain order when chaos would surely have prevailed had he not been in the chair.

We will all certainly miss his intellect, skill, and knowledge of the workings of the House. But probably the greatest loss will be that of a treasured colleague and friend.●

● Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of knowing DICK BOLLING for over 25 years. During that time, I can vividly remember the impact that he had as a relatively new Member of Congress in his early years and how his influence has grown.

I feel the work that he did in his 34 years in Congress has been extremely important. When I was elected as a

Member of the 97th Congress, the impact that DICK BOLLING had on the legislative process became even more apparent to me. It was the groundwork that Mr. BOLLING laid early in his career that allowed new Members such as myself to fully participate at the committee level and on the floor in the Halls of Congress. Mr. BOLLING's accomplishments have had a very important effect on the manner in which business is conducted in this august body.

His importance in the leadership of the Democratic Party was a great influence in allowing new members of the delegation to have an opportunity to serve on the committees that they felt were of importance to their districts.

I want to publicly thank Mr. BOLLING for the tremendous help he has been to me and to other Members. I am confident that his influence here will remain while he personally will be missed.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in paying tribute to the service of our retiring colleague, the Honorable DICK BOLLING, of Missouri.

DICK is known by his colleagues for his great integrity and sound judgment. His chairmanship of the Rules Committee has been respected and admired by all of us. His perceptive insights and broad experience in the committee's important responsibility will be hard to replace.

DICK BOLLING has served his district for over 30 years, as a voice of reason and sound public policy. DICK's experience and understanding of the law have added great strength to this Congress. And above all, he is a gentleman of unquestioned integrity and competence.

My wife joins me in wishing him every happiness in the years ahead. I assure him that he will be missed here in the House.●

● Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take considerable pleasure in participating in this special order to honor my chairman, colleague, and good friend, the dean of our Missouri delegation, RICHARD BOLLING.

DICK BOLLING has served his State and Nation well, as a citizen, soldier, teacher, legislator, and even as an athletic coach. I am not certain what kind of record his teams compiled but I would submit that they not only would have known how to play the game but also would be thoroughly imbued with the rules as well. Subsequently, any team coached by DICK BOLLING would undoubtedly have more winners than losers.

As a minority member of the Committee on Rules I have found the chairman to be an eloquent advocate of his party's position while always giving all an opportunity to be heard. This comes from many years of service

in the House of Representatives where comity is a way of life and the ability to count the votes is absolutely essential to strong leadership.

The publication "Politics in America" noted that during his more than 30 years in the House, RICHARD has exerted considerable influence over the legislative process of the House. It described him as the "intellectual father of the reform movement that changed the institution in the 1970's." Certainly he has made a mark on the Congress that will endure for many, many years after he has left these Chambers.

I am not certain as to the retirement plans of our colleague, but I assume that following a period of reflection of his work in this body, another book will be forthcoming to join the two he has already produced. And, I would imagine, that the fishing plugs I presented him a few weeks ago will eventually be put to good use. Undoubtedly, we will be seeing quite a bit of DICK BOLLING in the Seventh District where our fishing waters are among the best in the country.

We wish for RICHARD BOLLING the best. May his retirement be relaxed and enjoyable.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join with the Missouri delegation and the rest of my colleagues to honor DICK BOLLING, as he begins his last year of congressional service. I learned of his decision not to seek reelection with sorrow, and I look back on his years in Congress with a great deal of respect.

DICK BOLLING is a man whose interests have ranged over a variety of areas—he has been honored for his contribution to the fields of law, art, athletics and political science. His widespread interests may be due to the fact that DICK BOLLING is, above all, a strategist. He is committed to political process and legislative technique as the essential means to an end, and he has never limited himself to a single area of interest.

BOLLING was instrumental in formulating the new budget system, and in softening the existing seniority system. He protected the 1957 civil rights legislation when it was in danger being buried in committee. And, he gave rise to the first vote to put the House on record as supporting restoration of minimum social security benefits—this technique may have been the most important impetus in getting actual legislative change.

DICK has always shown us a contempt for rhetoric over detail. His work to change the committee system and make voting procedures on the floor more accountable attest to his belief in the importance in the way a thing is done, and his expertise in the art of strategy.

The Rules Committee chairman is a strong party man and he taught many

of us the meaning of party loyalty. Yet he is individualistic in his approach to issues and always encourages personal decisions in others. Dick is a man of the highest integrity and dedication; he is a perfectionist whose opinions and strategies will always influence me.

I understand that Dick is retiring to write a "modern version of Machiavelli." I think he underestimates himself in the comparison. He is one person whose political advice I will always listen to with a great deal of trust. ●

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the special order to pay tribute to RICHARD BOLLING, the chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

I have had the honor to serve on the Rules Committee for the past year under the chairmanship of DICK BOLLING. Although I am still a newcomer to the committee, I am keenly aware of the many contributions DICK BOLLING has made, both to the committee and to the entire House of Representatives. It is an honor and a privilege for me to have served on the committee during his chairmanship.

DICK BOLLING is one of those rare figures in legislative history who already is a legend in his own time. Even a new member of the committee like me knows that DICK BOLLING is an institution—a man who has made his mark in the House and helped to shape the course of the legislative process.

He has brought to his chairmanship a deep appreciation for history and an enduring respect for the integrity of the House and its procedures. He has always been aware that even the smallest procedural skirmish can have lasting implications for the manner in which future Congresses conduct themselves.

He has treated the rules of the House with great respect, and worked to insure procedural fair play and the protection of the rights of the minority on any given issue. He has loved this institution too much to tolerate the abuse of its processes.

I think it is accurate to say that DICK BOLLING simply cannot be replaced. No chairman in the future will be able to duplicate his special style, humor, and intellect. We may have other great chairmen, but we will never have another DICK BOLLING. He is one of a kind.

While Dick will be missed by the entire House, those of us on the committee are certainly going to miss him the most. I wish Dick well as he looks forward to retirement, and I sincerely hope that he will stay in close touch with us. His public service may take a new form, but I am confident that his contributions to the committee and to the House are far from over. I hope that he will find happiness and fulfillment in the years to come. ●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when Congressman RICHARD BOLLING leaves the Congress at the end of this session, the institution will lose one of its strongest admirers and supporters.

As the chairman of the House Rules Committee, and a true scholar of the legislative system and the House itself, he is without equal. And, he has retained this position of utmost respect while still being true to the ideals of the Democratic Party. The institution needs the Dick Bollings to keep it vital and true to itself and the American people it serves. DICK BOLLING's shoes will not be easily filled.

During his 17 terms in the House, DICK BOLLING has come to exemplify the highest standards of statesmanship, leadership, and integrity. He has paved the way for reform and continually challenged House practices and procedures.

While I have not always agreed with him, I have never questioned his sincerity or motives. DICK BOLLING will be sorely missed, and I will be among those who will miss him most. ●

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the first of the many special orders of farewell that will take place this year should be for the purpose of expressing our feelings about RICHARD BOLLING of Missouri. For in this generation no Member has brought more respect to this House.

If it were the custom for a Member of this body to be given a most-valuable-player award, as is done in the world of sports, RICHARD BOLLING would have won the award many times.

Long before I was elected to the House myself, I knew of DICK BOLLING's outstanding role. I knew also that he had played a leading part in the fight within the American Veterans Committee to prevent that organization from being taken over by the extreme left wing.

In my first year in the House, I watched in something akin to awe as Mr. BOLLING presided, with skill, patience, firmness, and total command of the rules, over the Committee of the Whole during the consideration of the Voting Rights Act. This experience was repeated many times as Speakers selected the gentleman from Missouri to preside when a skilled Parliamentarian was especially needed.

In the early 1970's I had the privilege of working closely with DICK BOLLING on a task force set up by the Democratic Study Group to consider what should be done about the rigid system of selecting Democratic committee chairmen solely on the basis of seniority. From that task force came the idea of setting up a strong Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, which would serve among other things as the Democratic Committee on Committees and which was given the re-

sponsibility of recommending committee chairpersons to the Democratic Caucus, taking into account seniority but not bound by it.

DICK BOLLING has been not only by all odds the House's leading expert on our rules, but he also has a love and respect for the House as an institution that is, I think, unique. I say this knowing full well that he wrote distinguished books and articles criticizing the performance of the House as a legislative body. His criticisms were never solely negative, but were always accompanied by constructive suggestions for improvement.

It was highly appropriate that, toward the end of his House career, Mr. BOLLING should have succeeded to the chairmanship of the Committee on Rules, but it is a corresponding pity that his service in that capacity should be so short. Not surprisingly, during his chairmanship Mr. BOLLING has developed imaginative techniques for bringing some kind of discipline and control to the floor consideration of complicated and controversial bills.

I deeply regret that DICK BOLLING has found it necessary to retire from the House, but I am sure that his service to the Nation is far from over. I wish him well in whatever he undertakes. ●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join in paying tribute to DICK BOLLING. I want to especially commend the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. GEPHARDT, for his foresight in scheduling this special order in January. The record of these proceedings should provide an interesting reference for Dick as the session progresses, the pace becomes more frenzied, and passions rise.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure for me to serve in the House of Representatives with DICK BOLLING. Few Members in the history of this body could match his zeal, his dedication, or his legislative skill. He is a man of conviction who possesses an uncommon ability to translate conviction into useful action.

All of us would like to leave this House with the feeling that our service here has made a difference. Whether it is through a piece of legislation of which we are particularly proud, or an issue with which we are closely identified, I think that most of us hope that we will leave a record demonstrating that our work has been of special value. During his career, DICK BOLLING has had a hand in shaping some of the most important legislation of our time. His legislative acumen, as displayed in his chairmanship of the Rules Committee, has earned him the respect of his colleagues. His reputation as a legislator is secure. I believe, however, that the contributions for which DICK BOLLING will be most remembered when he

leaves the House will be those he has made to the institution itself.

One of the unfortunate byproducts of our frantic schedule is that it does not encourage Members of Congress to give much thought to the manner in which Congress operates. DICK BOLLING, however, has never been content to accept the notion that the institution of Congress is not susceptible to change. He has devoted years of his life to a study of the history of the House and the mechanisms by which it performs its tasks. When that study led him to conclude that changes in the structure of the House could improve its operation, he was not afraid to advocate those changes. The House that DICK BOLLING will leave at the end of this session is truly different from the one in which he served as a freshman. The most important differences are ones which he played a central role in creating, and it will be by them that he is most remembered.

Mr. Speaker, the coming session of Congress may be one of the most important in recent years. DICK BOLLING's wisdom and guidance will be valuable commodities in the days ahead. I look forward to working with him on the difficult problems with which we will be faced as he completes a distinguished career in service to the Nation. ●

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, DICK BOLLING will be retiring from Congress this year. He has chosen not to run for office again, but will instead write a book on power that I am sure will outsell Machiavelli's.

We have called this special order several months in advance of Dick's leaving. The reason is that he is going to dislike the whole panoply of eulogy so much that it is better to get it over with now, rather than spoil his last days here with fulsome praise.

DICK BOLLING would not like that because he is a modest man. He is a dedicated fisherman, as I am, and who has ever heard a fisherman brag? Therefore, I know he is modest.

He is, in fact, so modest that the Rules Committee hearing room would not now—nor indeed ever—have a portrait of its latest chairman were it not for the fact that Dick entered into a conspiracy to sit for his portrait as a ploy to get his beloved wife Jim to sit for hers. This remarkable woman, who had no vanity, would not agree to have hers done unless he did. And that is why the hearing room is graced as it is with a likeness of the chairman—casual, jaunty, and exuding confidence.

DICK BOLLING is modest, and he is a man with a heart which, I might add, he had even before his recent cardiac surgery. Rumors to the contrary notwithstanding he did not have a heart implant. What beats within his chest has been described as a "solid, liberal heart" by Richard Cohen in the Na-

tional Journal. I told him, "Dick, if it ain't broke, don't fix it," but he went ahead anyway and became a fellow member of the cardiac surgery club of Capitol Hill.

I wanted to reach for some levity here, Mr. Speaker, because, inevitable as this time must be—for sooner or later, of course, Dick would have retired—it is still almost impossible to contemplate a House of Representatives without RICHARD BOLLING. It is impossible, and painful as well, for DICK BOLLING is not only a brilliant legislator esteemed by all of us, he is a loved, close friend of mine.

We might find a clue to what has driven Dick to such extraordinary accomplishments if we look at an article he inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a year ago, a lecture delivered by biologist Lewis Thomas, author of "The Lives of a Cell." The lecture is entitled "On the Uses of Biology," and Dick called it one of the most stimulating and thoughtful statements about our world and our condition that he had ever seen.

Dr. Thomas says:

I am willing to predict, uncertainly, provisionally, that there is one central, universal aspect of human behavior, genetically set by our very nature, biologically governed, driving each of us along. Depending on how one looks at it, it can be defined as the urge to be useful. This urge drives society along, sets our behaviour as individuals and in groups, invents all our myths, writes our poetry, composes our music.

I think it was truly this elemental and exalted drive to be useful that led DICK BOLLING to make an imprint on this House of Representatives that has been unlike any other imprint.

Since 1949, he has applied his 21-jewel mind, his cool, astringent judgment—in the words of Dennis Farney of the Wall Street Journal—to the institutional problems of Congress. His books, "Power in the House" and "House Out of Order," are well known, and an eager audience is assured for the book he will write upon retiring.

He leaves us the valuable legacy of his optimism about the capabilities of Congress, if the institution, as the primary instrument of democracy, can keep itself in tune with and responsive to the needs of the times. He has also warned how dangerous it could be if Congress becomes fossilized, rigid, overextravagant, or if it puts the interests of a few ahead of the national good.

Addressing the first Workshop on Congressional Oversight in 1978, he forcefully stated the need for Congress to get its house in order:

If it is impossible for us to perform our function in the House of Representatives, not with absolute efficiency—I do not expect that—but with reasonable efficiency and reasonable economy, then the people are going to get rid of us. And as soon as they get rid of the House or Representatives—in my opinion—we are going to end

up with an all-powerful President and at that point we are going to end up with the beginnings of totalitarianism.

Dick has always been the champion of Congress. He has applied his formidable intellect to searching for ways to improve congressional health, vigor, and viability, particularly vis-a-vis the executive branch.

I am not going to attempt to list all his accomplishments; most of them are well known. Structurally, he was the major architect of the Budget Act of 1974. Legislatively, he was one of the driving forces behind the important civil rights legislation of the past quarter of a century.

He is a consummate politician, but he refuses to compromise his principles, one of which is a deep belief in equal rights and equal educational opportunities for all Americans. Perhaps his greatest legislative efforts have been directed to these ends.

During the Vietnam war, he opposed the college deferment for the draft, feeling that the burden of military service was being unfairly distributed. Dick favored a national lottery instead.

As one of the six members of the subcommittee appointed to develop an ethics code for the House, Dick upheld the view, which ultimately triumphed, that a code of behavior for Members should confine itself to standards of official conduct, rather than the all-encompassing standards of conduct. If he had not insisted on this point, the barn door would have swung open to all manner of witch hunts.

I have to return to the lecture by Lewis Thomas that Dick inserted in the RECORD. Our main worry as humans, Thomas says, is how to be single, sentient beings, "fully aware of being aware and, at the same time, the working parts of a social species."

Thomas says that as social creatures we are at our best listening, intently and all together, to music in a concert hall.

DICK BOLLING's genius, it seems to me, derives from his belief that we have the potential to be equally at our best, as the working parts of a social species, on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I think this is so. I also think that if we ever realize our finest capabilities as an organ of democracy, a great deal of credit should go to DICK BOLLING. ●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Congressman DICK BOLLING at the end of this year will mark the end of a distinguished congressional career and will leave a definite void in the Congress of the United States.

It is a pleasure to join my colleagues in this tribute to DICK BOLLING, chairman of our Rules Committee, a position to which he has brought the in-

sight of a scholar and the abilities of a craftsman politician as the culmination of his outstanding service in the House of Representatives since 1948. DICK BOLLING has moved, with grace and ease, at the highest levels of power in the House of Representatives during that period. Over the years, DICK BOLLING has lent his considerable skills in the development of legislation that has benefited the Nation, his State of Missouri, and his constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of that State.

As Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and as a Hispanic Member of Congress, I know I speak for my constituents when we bid a fond adieu to DICK BOLLING. His record on behalf of minority groups and in the forefront of every issue confronting the less advantaged in our society is one that will shine many years beyond his departure from Congress.

Missouri is known to all of us as the "Show Me" State, a fact reflected on its license plates and a theory embodied in the adage that if you can convince a person from Missouri that something is true, he or she will be convinced for life.

DICK BOLLING has shown us that you can be a scholar and a legislator, a person with insight into the future and also an individual unerringly diligent in the day-to-day performance of legislative tasks and skills. We wish DICK BOLLING the best in his future endeavors. ●

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of statements that have been sent by Members who, unfortunately, could not be here today, and all of them will be included under the unanimous consent request that I just made. There is one statement that one Member asked me to read because of his long and close relationship with RICHARD BOLLING, and he was very distressed that he could not be here today. Therefore, I want to read that statement into the RECORD. It is a statement by the Member from Colorado, (Mr. WIRTH).

His statement says this: As today we honor RICHARD BOLLING, a number of impressions flash across my mind:

My first meeting, when as a student, I heard Dick transmit that characteristic blunt, perceptive fascination with the Congress that I later came to know so well;

Evenings at the BOLLINGS, sharing the quick and learned conversation with Jim and Dick;

Reform battles in the Congress, with so many of us looking to Dick for a reading on the limits to what we could do;

Long afternoons in the Rules Committee Office, hearing of our history as an institution, and the decent and democratic commitments that are so much a part of it;

Our great sense of loss when Jim died, for she and Dick together had meant so much to Wren and me—and she alone had taught us both;

And now the feeling of responsibility that comes to us who stay here. We have been well coached, the tradition is there, the commitment to what is right in this country has been reflected in one man.

We have a big job ahead of us, and we thank you, DICK BOLLING, and we thank Jim, for your great help.

□ 1540

I would add, Mr. Speaker, that I would echo all of the sentiments that were in what I think is a very touching and meaningful statement by TIM WIRTH.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for his words. I especially appreciate being able to be a small part of this special order for our retiring colleague DICK BOLLING, together with DICK GEPHARDT.

It has been said that there is no substitute for wisdom. We all know there is no substitute for friendship and we have learned from hearing the distinguished colleagues of ours today that there is no substitute for DICK BOLLING. DICK BOLLING is a great Congressman, he is a great friend, he is a great Missourian, and he is a great American. One of the thrills of my life is being able to serve with him as a Member of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MONETARY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, January 30, is the 100th anniversary of President Franklin Roosevelt's birth. As the Nation's airwaves and news columns are flooded with remembrances of F. D. R., it is best to recall what President Roosevelt did in the field of monetary policy, for our inflation, unemployment, and related problems are a continual reminder of his monetary policy.

Inaugurated on March 4, 1933, President Roosevelt did not waste any time. On March 6, he issued a proclamation declaring a bank holiday and a national emergency. This proclamation also prohibited the banks from paying out gold or dealing in foreign exchange. This was the first major interference with the gold standard since World War I. Eventually it resulted in the ultimate abandonment of the gold standard entirely. President Roosevelt summoned Congress to an extraordinary session on March 9, in order to legitimize his declaration of March 6.

The bill to legitimize his actions, however, was not ready on March 9, and the administration could not wait for a bill to be prepared. A folded newspaper was tossed into the hopper of the House of Representatives to serve as a bill until the bill could be written. The bill was then sent to the Congress by the President; Congress passed it instantly and gave the President full powers over foreign exchange and extraordinary powers over the banking system.

But the bank holiday was but the beginning of a list of monetary achievements of the Roosevelt administration which included: First, repudiation of the U.S. Treasury promises to pay gold; second, seizure of the gold owned by the American people; third, debasement of the currency; fourth, deliberate inflation; fifth, deficit spending; sixth, monetization of Government debt; and seventh, confiscation of privately owned gold previously seized by the Government. This was achieved despite the fact that the first three planks of the Democratic Party platform of 1932 read as follows:

We advocate (1) an immediate and drastic reduction of Government expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent of the cost of Federal Government * * * (2) Maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced * * * (3) A sound currency to be maintained at all hazards.

One day after the passage of the Emergency Banking Act, on March 10, 1933, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 6073, permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations or licenses with respect to gold exports. On March 13, 1933, the Secretary of the Treasury by regulation authorized the Federal Reserve Banks temporarily "to deliver gold in amounts deemed by such banks to be reasonably required for legitimate and customary uses in trade, profession, or art." A month later on April 19, 1933, the Secretary of the Treasury announced that no further licenses to export gold for foreign account would be granted until further notice. The same action was taken with respect to gold already earmarked for foreign account. The effect of this action was, for the first time, to withdraw the support of gold shipments from the foreign exchange value of the dollar with the result that thereafter the progressive decline of the dollar in terms of foreign currency took place.

On April 5, a month after he had issued the decree closing the banks, President Roosevelt issued a decree seizing the gold owned by the American people. Executive Order No. 6102 declared that:

All persons are hereby required to deliver on or before May 1, 1933, to a Federal Reserve Bank or a branch or agency thereof or

to any member bank of the Federal Reserve System all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates now owned by them or coming into their ownership on or before April 28, 1933.

President Roosevelt cited an emergency World War I measure, the Trading With The Enemy Act, as authority for his Executive order seizing all privately owned gold. Executive Order No. 6102 further provided that:

Whoever willfully violates any provision of this Executive order or of these regulations or of any rule, regulation, or license issued thereunder may be fined not more than \$10,000, or if a natural person, may be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

On April 20, 1933, another Executive order was issued which redefined the export and license privilege. On May 12, 1933, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act was signed into law by President Roosevelt. The act permitted the issuing of \$3 billion worth of greenbacks in order to pay off the national debt, and authorized the President to—

Fix the weight of the gold dollar in grains 0.9 fine, and also to fix the weight of the silver dollar in grains 0.9 fine at a definite fixed ratio in relation to the gold dollar at such amounts as he finds necessary from his investigation to stabilize domestic prices, or in accordance with any international agreement arrived at by the President.

The only limit imposed on this debasement of the dollar was that its weight could not be reduced by more than 50 percent.

On June 5, 1933, House Joint Resolution 192 was enacted by the Congress and signed by the President. This joint resolution declared that any fiat currency issued by the Government would be "Legal tender for all debts, public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues." The joint resolution also abrogated all public and private obligations in which payment was to be made in gold. The resolution provided that—

Every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy, and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts.

On August 28, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt issued yet another Executive order—No. 6260—in which he prescribed regulations concerning the export and earmarking of gold coin, bullion, and currency, and transactions in foreign exchange. Again, he used a World War I measure as justification for his declaration.

The following January, January 15, 1934, President Roosevelt addressed Congress and asked that Congress enact a law placing all right and title to gold held by the Federal Reserve Banks in the Government. Having seized privately owned gold the previous year, now the Government was to assume title of it in a massive confiscation of private property. Congress responded 15 days later by enacting the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. The act provided that the Government assumed all title to gold coin and bullion in the United States; that no gold coins were to be issued; and that no currency of the United States could be redeemed in gold dollars. The act provided that—

No gold shall hereafter be coined, and no gold coins shall hereafter be paid out or delivered by the United States. * * * All gold coin in the United States shall be withdrawn from circulation and together with all other gold owned by the United States shall be formed into bars of such weights and degrees of fineness as the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct.

Further, the act provided that—

No currency of the United States shall be redeemed in gold.

The following day, January 31, 1934, President Roosevelt issued still another proclamation changing the gold content of the dollar, which was no longer circulating, from 25.8 grains to 15.521 grains, a devaluation of 41 percent.

In his speech of January 15, 1934, President Roosevelt stated that—

Free circulation of gold coins is unnecessary, leads to hoarding, and tends to a possible weakening of national financial structures in times of emergency. The practice of transferring gold from one individual to another, or from the Government to an individual within a nation, is not only unnecessary but is in every way undesirable. The transfer of gold and bullion is essential only for the payment of international trade balances; therefore, it is a prudent step to vest in the Government of a nation the title to and possession of all monetary gold within its boundaries, and to keep that gold in the form of bullion rather than coin.

Amazingly, the two principles upon which President Roosevelt based these actions were:

- (1) Our national currency must be maintained as a sound currency which insofar as possible will have a fairly constant standard of purchasing power; and
- (2) The inherent right of Government to issue currency and to be the sole custodian and owner of the base or reserve of precious metals underlying that currency.

Since President Roosevelt took this step to maintain a sound currency, the dollar has depreciated to a minor fraction of what it was worth in 1933. So much for his first principle. As for his second principle concerning the—

Inherent right of government to issue currency and to be sole custodian and owner of the base or reserve of precious metals underlying that currency,

There is no basis either in fact or law for that principle. It seems to have sprung full grown only from his own imagination.

Senator Carter Glass, a Democrat and former Secretary of the Treasury under Woodrow Wilson, appeared in the Senate in April 1933, although he had been ill in bed, to speak about the administration's money policy. He said:

I wrote with my own hand that provision of the national Democratic platform which declared for a sound currency to be maintained at all hazards. * * *

With nearly 40 percent of the entire gold supply of the world, why are we going off the gold standard? With all the earmarked gold, with all the securities of ours they hold, foreign governments could withdraw in total less than \$700 million of our gold, which would leave us an ample fund of gold in the extreme case to maintain gold payments both at home and abroad. * * * To me, the suggestion that we may devalue the gold dollar 59 per cent means national repudiation. To me, it means dishonor. In my conception of it, it is immoral. * * * There never was any necessity for a gold embargo; there's no necessity for making statutory criminals of citizens of the United States who may please to take their property in the shape of gold or currency out of the banks and use it for their own purposes as they may please. We have gone beyond the cruel extremities of the French, and they made it a capital crime, punishable at the guillotine, for any tradesman or individual citizen of the realm to discriminate in favor of gold and against their printing press currency. We have gone beyond that; we have said that no man may have his [own] gold, and the penalty is 10 years in the penitentiary or \$10,000 fine.

Within the space of a few months, Franklin Roosevelt wrecked a monetary system that had protected the American people for over a century. It is ironic that many succeeding members of his own party have decried the imperial Presidency. Nothing could have been more imperial than the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt, particularly with regard to the gold standard.

There was no need to leave the gold standard in 1933. The suspension of gold payments was presumably regarded as part of the banking emergency and, hence, expected to be temporary. The gold position of the Government in March 1933 was sufficiently strong so that there was little doubt the preceding gold parity could have been maintained if desired, just as Senator Glass argued in April. The ratio of the Government's gold stock to the total stock of money was higher than at any time since 1914.

There was, in short, no reason to confiscate privately owned gold or to leave the domestic gold standard. But the gold standard was regarded by President Roosevelt and his advisers as an obstacle to his plans to remake the American economy. Its removal was designed to put the American

people into a monetary straitjacket and to allow the Government to embark upon a 13-year binge of deficits and inflation.

The President thought that raising the price of gold would increase the price of all commodities, and it was price increases that he so avidly sought. Now, 50 years later, we are suffering from the price increases Franklin Roosevelt desired.

While there was no reason to leave the gold standard in 1933—except, of course, to loosen the chains placed upon the Government by the Constitution—the Government immediately received a windfall for doing so. Debasement of the dollar by 41 percent meant that the Government now had about \$3 billion more to spend. Most of this money was put into a stabilization fund that was established to mitigate the damage Roosevelt's prohibition of gold exports had caused, and the remainder was spent on interventionist programs in the domestic economy. In his diary, Henry Morgenthau gives us a glimpse of the President gradually debasing the dollar by choosing "lucky numbers" as the new "gold price."

However lucky this monetary policy was for President Roosevelt—after all he was President for life—it was singularly unfortunate for the American people.

The initial robbery of the gold seizure—which Senator Glass rightly called immoral—has now been compounded many times by the continual issuing of fiat paper currency. Inflation is theft, and inflation has been the deliberate policy of the Government since 1933.

Mr. Speaker, last summer this House appropriated \$30,000 more to a Commission that has been trying for 25 years to find a suitable monument for Franklin Roosevelt. That monument already surrounds us: Inflation, unemployment, bankruptcies, and increasingly worthless paper bills in everyone's pockets.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt ushered in the age of Keynesian economics and put into practice the erroneous ideas of economic interventionism. Along with this we have suffered the ill effects of international intervention and Government abuse of our personal liberties. The fruits of all these ill-conceived notions are all around us, and New Dealism deserves reappraisal on this anniversary of Roosevelt's birth.●

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY HONORS SPANISH CIVIL WAR VETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CROCKETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute some unsung heroes in American history. On Satur-

day, February 13, 1982, Pete Seeger is presenting a benefit concert at Wayne State University in Michigan's 13th Congressional District to help establish a scholarship fund to honor the four Wayne students who fought to defend democracy in the Spanish Civil War.

On July 18, 1936, contingents of the Spanish Army and Air Force in Spanish Morocco revolted against the government in Madrid and launched a civil war that was to cost over 650,000 lives during a 34-month period. The rebels represented the Falange, a movement inspired, in part, by the Fascist regimes of Hitler and Mussolini. Dominated by socialists and social democrats, the democratic Republican government had ruled since 1931 after the monarchy was overthrown by a bloodless coup. In an attempt to contain the civil war, the European powers agreed to refrain from intervening in Spain. The then-isolationist United States approved of the noninterventionist policy and, in 1937, extended its own neutrality laws to civil wars. This policy, which included an arms embargo, was unprecedented since legitimate governments had always been able to purchase arms during civil wars.

Italy, Germany, and Fascist Portugal first violated the nonintervention pledge. The Italians sent 60,000 "volunteers" into combat in Spain while the Nazis sent their Condor Legion which soon established Fascist mastery in the air. The Nazi fliers tried out tactics they later used successfully in Poland, Belgium, Holland, and France. In a relatively feeble counter move, the Soviet Union sent money, military supplies, and advisers to assist the Republic. Moscow also helped organize the International Brigades.

Over 30,000 volunteers from 53 different countries joined the International Brigades to aid the Spanish Republic. Among them were more than 3,000 Americans who fought in the Abraham Lincoln and the Canadian Mackenzie-Papineau battalions. Violating their country's neutrality laws, they traveled past suspicious American agents to France from where they were smuggled across the French border into Spain. Seamen, students, teachers, miners, longshoremen, and steelworkers were among the wide variety of Americans who fought for the Republic. In addition, as many as 100 black Americans helped to constitute the U.S. first integrated armed service.

Americans went to Spain for a variety of reasons. Among the complex mix of motivations that led them to join the brigades were: A deep commitment to the survival of democracy in Spain; concern about the containment of European fascism; support for the interests of the Soviet Union; a lust for adventure; and a feeling that their sacrifice might popularize the Republican

cause and thus force the democracies to lift their arms embargo.

Four Wayne State University students—Marsden Moran, Roy McQuarry, Joe Rubenstein, and Robert Nagle—joined the hundreds of college students among the American volunteers. The untrained but enthusiastic brigadeers were often used as shock troops on the front lines in those tragically bloody campaigns of the civil war. Fewer than half of the American brigadeers survived, and of those, more than three quarters required medical treatment upon their return. For their efforts, many of the survivors were hounded for being members of a subversive group—the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade—or for being Communists or fellow travelers, or for being permanent anti-Fascists. This persecution took place despite the fact that the vast majority of the vets had served in the American military or merchant marine during World War II.

Although Madrid fell in March of 1939 and Spain was to suffer under a third of a century of Fascist rule, the courage and idealism of the Americans who fought to defend democracy has not been forgotten. I join in honoring Wayne State's contingent in the International Brigades in whose name a scholarship fund will be established, and thus celebrate these American heroes whose contributions to the perpetual struggle for liberty and justice serve as an inspiration to us all.●

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SWIFT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. AUCOIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. COELHO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CROCKETT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LEVITAS, for 60 minutes, on February 2.
Mr. WEISS, for 60 minutes, on February 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JAMES K. COYNE.
Mrs. HOLT.
Mr. DANNMEYER.
Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. FISH.
 Mr. RITTER in two instances.
 Mr. NELLIGAN.
 Mr. BEREUTER in three instances.
 Mr. SOLOMON.
 Mr. HYDE.
 Mr. WINN.
 Mr. McGRATH.
 Mr. McCLORY in three instances.
 Mr. DERWINSKI.
 Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
 Mr. LOTT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SWIFT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BONKER.
 Mr. FORD of Michigan.
 Mr. NELSON.
 Mr. GAYDOS.
 Mr. EVANS of Georgia.
 Mr. MINETA.
 Mr. MATTOX.
 Mr. OBERSTAR.
 Mr. LEHMAN.
 Mr. DWYER.
 Mr. APPLEGATE.
 Mr. RODINO.
 Mr. MOFFETT.
 Mr. BINGHAM in 10 instances.
 Mr. PANETTA.
 Mr. RICHMOND.
 Mr. DOWNEY.
 Mr. HALL of Ohio.
 Mr. HUGHES in two instances.
 Mr. PEPPER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 29, 1982, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2901. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on progress toward conclusion of a negotiated solution to the Cyprus problem, pursuant to section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (H. Doc. No. 97-135); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2902. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting notice of two violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act, pursuant to section 3679(i)(2) of the revised statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2903. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a list of contract award dates for the period February 15 to March 15, 1982, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 139; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2904. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise and standardize the

provisions of law relating to the authority of the Secretaries of the Military Departments to order certain retired and other similarly situated members of the armed forces to active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2905. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize ordering reserve commissioned officers of the Army on active duty (other than for training) to serve on active duty in a grade to which promoted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2906. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, covering the quarter ended December 31, 1981, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 and Executive Order 12148; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2907. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's sixth annual report on the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, pursuant to section 707 of Public Law 90-321, as amended; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2908. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the third biennial report on the status of health professions personnel in the United States, pursuant to section 708(d) of the Public Health Services Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2909. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a proposed regulation governing the sale of used motor vehicles, pursuant to section 21(g)(2) of Public Law 96-252; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2910. A letter from the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting notice of the Commission's inability to render a final decision in docket No. 9256, *Joint-Line Route Cancellation on Soda Ash by the Union Pacific Railroad*, within the initially-specified 5-month period, pursuant to 49 USC 10707(b)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2911. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, the tenth annual report of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, together with his comments thereon, pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 95-63; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2912. A letter from the Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, transmitting his tenth quarterly report on the status of the system, covering the period ended December 31, 1981, pursuant to section 7(a)(5)(E) of Public Law 94-586; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

2913. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting recommendations adopted by the Assembly of the Administrative Conference at its 23rd Plenary Session; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 5383. A bill to give trade negotiating priority to service sector issues and to expand and clarify the coverage of existing trade laws to better deal with service trade problems, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. ZERETTI, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FARY, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. CORRADA, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 5384. A bill to assist in the admission into the United States of certain aliens who have fled from Poland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H.R. 5385. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax benefits enacted during 1981 which provided a special deduction for Members of Congress with respect to their living expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5386. A bill to provide for the temporary duty-free treatment of imported haters' fur, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY:

H.R. 5387. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain reserve general and flag officers serving on active duty may not be counted against statutory and administrative ceilings imposed on the number of general and flag officers who may be serving on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 5388. A bill to provide appropriations for an Agricultural Export Credit Revolving Fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

H.R. 5389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for youth employment during the summer of 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 5390. A bill to appropriate funds for grants to States for unemployment insurance and employment services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 5391. A bill to rescind the tax benefits provided during 1981 to Members of Congress for living expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 5392. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study of handgun bullets manufactured in or imported into the United States, to determine which bullets have the capacity to penetrate bulletproof vests commonly used by law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.R. 5393. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present, on behalf of the Congress, a Gold Medal to Lenny Skutnik, and to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike duplicates of such medal for public sale; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 5394. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the Attorney General to acquire and exchange information to assist Federal, State, and local officials in the identification of certain deceased individuals and in the location of missing children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 5395. A bill to reform the insanity defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5396. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in honor of the 300th anniversary of William Penn's founding of Philadelphia; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5397. A bill to designate the building known as the Old Federal Building in Philadelphia, Pa., as the "Robert N. C. Nix Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution proclaiming William Penn and Hannah Callowhill Penn to be honorary citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of Congress for the continued provision of full medical service for veterans over age 65; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COELHO:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain withholding taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution disapproving the Federal Trade Commission trade regulation rule relating to the sale of used motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. D'AMOURS:

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that no new withholding tax should be imposed on interest and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution disapproving the Federal Trade Commission trade regulation rule relating to the sale of used motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SILJANDER:

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution disapproving the action of the Council of the District of Columbia approving the Natural Death Act of 1981; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. HERTEL (for himself, Mr. ALBOSTA, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. WOLPE):

H. Res. 328. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that January 30, 1982, should be observed as a national day of solidarity with the people of Poland; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H. Res. 329. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to decrease the amount of outside earned income which a Member may accept, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H. Res. 330. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Science and Technology in the second session of the Ninety-seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON):

H. Res. 331. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be

conducted by the Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 332. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that priority attention be given to recommendations of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

243. By Mr. BRINKLEY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and designating the Roosevelt/Warm Springs Institute for Rehabilitation as a living memorial to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

244. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Federal taxes on gasoline and fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BROWN of California introduced a bill (H.R. 5398) for the relief of Toshiko Imamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 444: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 445: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 464: Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 808: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MORRISON, and Mr. BINGHAM.

H.R. 846: Mr. FRENZEL.

H.R. 1522: Mr. WEBER of Ohio.

H.R. 1937: Mr. CONTE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. WHITLEY, and Mr. ANTHONY.

H.R. 2052: Mr. DAN DANIEL.

H.R. 2251: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2280: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MINISH, Mr. DYSON, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. MOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CORCORAN, Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEILSON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. PATTERSON, Mr. MADIGAN, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DWYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROE, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. BARNES, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 2488: Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. MORRISON.

H.R. 4326: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DENARDIS, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. EMERY, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. QUILLLEN, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 4389: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 4467: Mr. BIAGGI and Mr. PEYSER.

H.R. 4509: Mr. HUBBARD and Mr. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 4727: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 4786: Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. GRISHAM, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. ERDAHL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. TRIBBLE, Mr. HANSEN of Utah, Mr. RATCHFORD, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LENT, Mr. FLORIO, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. EDGAR, and Mr. ATKINSON.

H.R. 4810: Mr. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 4833: Mr. RHODES, Mr. EVANS of Georgia, and Mr. HANSEN of Utah.

H.R. 4842: Mr. PRICE, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. TRIBBLE, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 4953: Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 5001: Mr. PATTERSON and Mr. CRAIG.

H.R. 5102: Mr. EVANS of Georgia, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. PHILIP M. CRANE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HENDON, and Mrs. BOUQUARD.

H.R. 5163: Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. ZEPERETTI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LENT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PEYSER, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 5252: Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BENEDICT, Mr. DUNN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. RUDD, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 5255: Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BENEDICT, and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 5256: Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BENEDICT, and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 5348: Mrs. HOLT, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MICA, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. BENNETT.

H.J. Res. 151: Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CLAUSEN, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. LEBOUTILLIER, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. NAPIER, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. DERWINSKI.

H.J. Res. 197: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.J. Res. 363: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LOEFELER, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.J. Res. 383: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. MARRIOTT, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ERLNBORN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. LEBOUTILLIER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. MOTT, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DREIER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. WINN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ROE, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. KOGOVSEK, Mrs. FENWICK, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. EMERY, and Mr. KINDNESS.

H.J. Res. 387: Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, and Mr. BEVILL.

H. Res. 200: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. CARMAN.

H. Res. 252: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ROE, and Mr. DANIELSON.

H. Res. 297: Mr. DOWDY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. AU COIN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr.

RAILSBACK, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BAILEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, and Mr. WYDEN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

333. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Arkansas Legislative Council, Little

Rock, relative to public employment services; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.